63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Speaker Hannig: "So the House will be in order and the Members will please be in their seats. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops turn off all cell phones and pagers and rise for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. We shall be led in prayer today by Reverend Mark Thompson who is the Pastor of Zion Lutheran Church in Lincoln, Illinois, and is currently serving in the Army National Guard as Chaplain of the 232nd Combat Service Support Battalion. Reverend Thompson is the guest of Representative Brauer."

Reverend Mark Thompson: "Let us pray. Dear Heavenly Father, Creator of Heaven and Earth, we thank You that You have ordained governments for the good of mankind. You have commanded obedience to the government and declared that those who govern are Your hand working in this world doing good for the government. We give thanks to You that the Members of this House have stepped forward to be part of our government. This is good and pleasing in Your sight. elected officials, the women and men of this Assembly are free, slaves to none and servants of all. May these lawmakers be ever mindful of their noble task and the trust committed to them that their hands be guided by justice. We ask, Oh God, that our Representatives be accorded the deference due the position they have been placed in. That the members of the media respect them in interviews, their constituents honor them, and the Governor give heed to their counsel. Grant to this Body wisdom to govern our state, collegiality in their deliberations and eyes that ever have those they serve before them so that they remember the past,

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

work for the present and their true faith to our future. Graciously bestow Your favor upon Illinois and her people, Oh God, upon all our states, the Congress of this great nation and our President that we be a people after Your own heart to the praise and glory of Your name. These things we ask in the name of Your Son who lives and reigns with You in the Holy Spirit. One God, now and forever. Amen."

- Speaker Hannig: "Representative McCarthy, will you lead us in the pledge."
- McCarthy et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Hannig: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect all Republicans are present and that we would love our chance to meet with the Governor as you had your chance yesterday. We'd... we'd love... there's a lot of things we'd like to comment to him about, but we are all here and we are ready."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representatives Graham and Patterson are excused today."
- Speaker Hannig: "Mr. Clerk, take the record. On... there are 116

  Members answering the Roll Call, a quorum is present. Mr.

  Clerk, read the Committee Reports."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Committee Reports. Representative Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on May 29,

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

2007, reported the with same back the following recommendations: 'recommends be adopted' is a Motion to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2304; 'do pass as amended Short Debate' is Senate Bill 778, Senate Bill 940 and Senate Bill 1400; 'do pass Short Debate' is Senate Bill 83 and Senate Bill 434. Representative Chapa LaVia, Chairperson from the Committee on Local Government, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on May 29, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass Short Debate' is Senate Bill 831 and Senate Bill 1568. Representative Hoffman, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation & Motor Vehicles, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on May 29, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendations: recommends 'be adopted' Senate Joint Resolution 28. Referred to the House Committee on Rules is House Resolution 478, offered by Representative Ryg and House Resolution 480, offered by Representative Ryg."

Speaker Hannig: "We're going to start on page 5 of the Calendar, under the Order of House Bills-Third Reading. I'm sorry, Senate Bills-Third Reading, and we have Senate Bill 8. Representative Chapa LaVia, do you wish us to read that Bill? Representative, you wish us to read the Bill? Okay. Do you wish us to read the Bill, Representative? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 8, a Bill for an Act concerning veterans. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Chapa LaVia."

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Chapa LaVia: "What... what we're doing with this Bill is we're creating a task force... Oh, actually, this the program that creates a Veterans' Home Nursing Loan Repayment Act. also creates the Post-traumatic Stress Disorder Outpatient Counseling Program. We've been working with the Department of Veterans' Affairs with Tammy Duckworth to come to some solutions to get the shortage of nursing... nurses in a veterans' homes taken care of along with post-traumatic stress and put a program in place. We are going to be working through this with the department to make sure that we're not duplicating any services at the federal level. Amendment #1 just clarifies terms of the loan repayment program to reflect that one-year's scholarship requires one (1) year of working at a veterans home. language was very vague on this point so we had to clarify that and it was prepared by the ISAC and it matches their administrative rules on the subject. And it removes the language concerning the property tax homestead exemption for disabled veterans due to single subject concerns. exemption is likely to be run in a separate Bill, so I've spoken with the Senate... the Senate Sponsor on this and those two (2) changes are perfectly fine. So I'm hoping to request an 'aye' vote from everybody on the two (2) subjects. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. And in response, the Lady from Cook, Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

- Mulligan: "Representative, I thought that basically this Bill only had the nurses' stipend to get them to work in the veterans' homes."
- Chapa LaVia: "It... it is."
- Mulligan: "All right. So now we added the post-traumatic stress care?"
- Chapa LaVia: "Well, it was part of the Bill and I know we discussed this. I think this is one of the Bills you and I met with Director Duckworth on, but all along it had the two (2) components of the Bill. We just never discussed the other one (1)."
- Mulligan: "Well, the other one (1), which we discussed that program, I was a little leery of the fact that we would be paying for something here in Illinois that I thought the Federal Government should be paying for."
- Chapa LaVia: "Correct. And we're going to be working on that to see if we can't find the Federal Government matching monies due to those two (2) Senate Bills or the House Bill that you did a Resolution on. We're still going to try to find the funding but what we want to do is... before the Bill gets actually signed, concur with the Veterans' Affairs Department again with your counsel of course, on which Bill, 'cause we have quite a few Bills out there. So we don't want to have the Governor sign something that the department doesn't want to work with or we can't find the funding for, 'cause that would be a hollow promise."
- Mulligan: "Well, I'm a Sponsor on this Bill, but when I was the Sponsor originally and I had wanted to pick up 'cause it was my Senator's Bill, I thought it was just a nursing program.

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

And the fact that they have a whole group in here pitching on how they're going to spend this money through the Department of Health Care and Family Services to do the post-traumatic stress which we think the Federal Government should pay for is problematic to me, because I don't know what that's going to cost and I'm not quite sure what they're doing. And I don't want to authorize by a Bill that says we're trying to get more nurses in veterans' homes, which is a really big issue, with the fact that we're going to expand a whole new health care... a whole new program to the Department of Health Care and Family Services that I thought needed a lot more examination than what we did and I'm really at..."

Chapa LaVia: "Right. Right. Well, what I suggested at the meeting and that you were there, is that we do more of an informational based program with all of the posts as opposed to providing the dollars, just do an information and getting that out to... for all the service members that are getting ready to be deployed about what to look at. So, I think that part of this Bill is pretty vague on what we actually can do and very general on how much we will do. The... the main focus of it is the program, of course subject to appropriation, of getting that information out and providing counseling and treatment services to war-affected veterans so they're getting information on where they can go for their VA benefits."

Mulligan: "So, we're putting a program out there that's a telephone psychiatric program, for the most part, with an agency that we need more information on that was never be...

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

presented before an Appropriations Committee, only in a meeting that was closed door, subject to appropriation then we don't appropriate the money for it because we think the Federal Government's going to get it, then we look bad because we haven't helped veterans with post-traumatic stress which is a really big issue. I... I really don't like the fact that this was encompassed in the Bill."

Chapa LaVia: "Okay. Well, let's do this."

Mulligan: "I... I..."

Chapa LaVia: "I'm sorry. Speaker, can you hold down the noise in the chamber? It's a little bit too loud out of respect for the Representative. What... what I can do, Rosemary, is why don't I pull the Bill off record and we get some language that is more substantial. I don't want to put forth something that's not going to be funded."

Mulligan: "Right. I'm... I'm really concerned over this, being in the Bill altogether..."

Chapa LaVia: "Okay."

Mulligan: "...the way it's set. I would like you to talk to the department. I would like to figure out how we're going to do it. I don't want to put a program out there then that we won't fund because that will look really bad."

Chapa LaVia: "Okay. Well, why don't we work together on this instead of taking time on the House Floor. Let's work together on this. Speaker, can you please pull the Bill off record?"

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Out of the record."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you. Thank you."

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

- Speaker Hannig: "On page 6 of the Calendar is Senate Bill 15.

  Representative Jakobsson, I understand you're going to handle this Bill. So Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 15, a Bill for an Act concerning public health. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Lady from Champaign, Representative Jakobsson."
- Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 15... give me just one moment, please. I've got to go back to find something. Senate Bill 15 provides an opportunity for women to be screened for postpartum depression. It allows for a woman who is in prenatal and postpartum with... just a moment, Provide information to women and their families about prenatal mental health disorders, more commonly referred to as postpartum depression, in order to lower the incident rate of postpartum depression. The Act requires that the Department of Human Services in conjunction with the Department of Health Care and Family Practices, the Department of Public Health and the Department of Financial and Professional Regulation and Medical Licensing Board to work with hospitals and licensed health care professions to develop policies, procedures and information and educational materials to help screen for postpartum depression."
- Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. And in response, the Lady from DuPage, Representative Bellock."
- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Representative. We had a lot of discussion about this in the Human Service Committee, and I wondered if you received any more information from the Med Society or from anybody else regarding my concerns over the… over screening issue? First of all I wanted to ask, is this mandatory screening of women?"
- Jakobsson: "No, it's not mandatory screening. This is something that the health care provider would be required to offer, but it's not mandatory for the woman to participate in."
- Bellock: "Okay. Then the women can refuse this test or whatever is going to be given to them?"
- Jakobsson: "Yes, the woman can refuse the screening."
- Bellock: "Okay. So when the test is given and a health care professional is the one giving the test, correct?"
- Jakobsson: "That's right."
- Bellock: "Okay. In an OB/GYN office or in a pediatrician's office?"
- Jakobsson: "That's correct."
- Bellock: "After the test is given and a certain score indicates that this woman... woman... the health care professional thinks needs psychiatric counseling, is that then put on their official medical record?"
- Jakobsson: "Well, this would be handled... the woman would be advised that she should look into care and I think she's protected under this the same way as any of our medical records are protected."
- Bellock: "But my concern, and I've done some research on this, is that if she is referred to psychiatric care, that will go on her medical record in that office and when a private

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

insurer, if she is applying for insurance at a later date and they bring up her record, that's my concern on screening is, will that be on there that she is, you know, a mental health patient now, because she's been referred to a psychiatrist?"

Jakobsson: "This doesn't change what's already in law and want goes on in a person's medical record."

Bellock: "But it does change that everyone that is going to an OB/GYN or a pediatrician now, will be invited to take a screening test, correct?"

Jakobsson: "Yes, invited to have that screening."

"Thank you very much, Representative. To the Bill. Bellock: The Children's Mental Health Act had part of it in for mandatory screening of all women that were going to OB/GYN office and pediatricians. Some of us here today fought that issue very hard. We got the mandated screening out, but I still have a concern about screening of children in schools. That's my only concern of this is, is that with people being screened will it be an issue that private insurers will use to decline insurance to those people? I certainly agree with postpartum depression and I'm a strong advocate of the... you know, mental health services for women that are suffering from postpartum depression. That's my only concern on the screening issue is insurance regards. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Osmond."

Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "To the Bill."

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Osmond: "I know there was questions about insurance coverage and last Friday I was asked to research this a little bit and I did find out that there is what's called a postpartum questionnaire. And on the que... it's given to applicants within three (3) months after the birth of their child and it's a simple questionnaire that just asks if they had a postpartum checkup, what was the results, was the baby born full term, just simple questions like that. The companies in general do not... would not deny coverage if they went through the postpartum process. They might surcharge if there was medication given, but the common thread was that there was... they would not be denied coverage. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Jakobsson to close."

Jakobsson: "Thank you. Because of the high incidence of postpartum depression, I think this is a good step in the right direction to make sure that women are screened for postpartum depression. Again, it's a voluntary screening. They'll be offered the screening but anyone can accept or deny taking the screening. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Molaro, Mautino, Flowers, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Howard, do you wish for us to read Senate Bill 62? Representative Howard, you wish us to do Senate Bill 62? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 62, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Howard."

Howard: "Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. As amended Senate Bill 62 expands the offense of aggravated assault to include an assault against a police officer when the defendant is armed with a BB gun. It clarifies definition of firearm in the aggravated assault statute and specifies that it is the same as the definition in the Firearm Owners Identification Act. It also removes the fifty dollar (\$50.00) minimum fine for nondealer violations of the Air Rifle Act. This was introduced in response to a incident that took place in Chicago in the summer of 2006, where a minor armed with a BB gun was made to look like... that was made to look like a Smith & Wesson semiautomatic pistol, robbed an individual. Later, when apprehended by the Chicago Police Department, the minor refused to put up his hands and drop what the officers believed to be a semiautomatic pistol and as a result he was fortunately nonfatally by the police. The Amendments removed the provision that raises the minimum age, I should have said that, and added a provision that bans the carrying or possession of a billy-club and inserts a provision to ban any person under the age of eighteen (18) from carrying an air rifle in any building used as a school unless they have received the prior approval of the principal. It would increase the age from thirteen (13) to eighteen (18) for which is unlawful to sell, lend, rent, give or transfer an air rifle."

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. We're going to put it on Standard Debate. And Representative Rose, you have 5 minutes."

Rose: "Thank you. Will the Lady yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady will yield."

Rose: "As I see here in Floor Amendment 2, the provision that would prevent someone under the age of eighteen (18) from owning a BB gun has been removed. Is that correct?"

Howard: "Yes, that is correct."

Rose: "Okay. In... unlawful use of weapons, if you were in a... an assault can be a lot of things, but my question is this, if you have some kids out having a good time, as downstaters do, perhaps they've got a BB gun war going on, is that kid now guilty of an aggravated assault?"

Howard: "Am I to understand that your question is, if a... if two (2) young people are having a good time and one of them has a BB gun that that person is then guilty of assault? Is that..."

Rose: "No, and I understand with your example, which is if someone's holding someone up with a BB gun that would be aggravated assault and I agree with that, and I'm glad you removed the provision for the under eighteen (18) years of age. My question is, if you've got a bunch of twelve (12) years... twelve year olds out shooting at each other and they've all participated in this game, despite the fact that you get hurt and it'd be a stupid game to participate in, but is that twelve-year-old now going to get charged with aggravated assault?"

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Howard: "No, that young person would not be charged with aggravated assault."

Rose: "And that's because the other participate was a willful participant?"

Howard: "We think that the way that this has been written is that the only aggravated assault would be that against a police officer."

Rose: "Okay. Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Bost: "Representative, I'm trying to get to the Bill as quick as possible here. I'll admit that I'm... what exactly are the differences between this Bill and the Bill that we ended up not passing that was a House Bill?"

Howard: "This Bill has been written to be much narrower in scope."

Bost: "Okay. So if I have a young man and young woman, fourteen (14), fifteen (15) years old in my district, they go to the local... let's say Hick's Trading Post in Pinckneyville, and they want to buy a BB gun, can they still do that under this law?"

Howard: "At twelve (12) years old you cannot."

Bost: "At twelve (12) years old you cannot. Can you right now?"

Howard: "You'd need to be eighteen (18) years of age..."

Bost: "Am I wrong on this that you need to be eighteen (18) years of age to purchase a BB gun? Or am I right?"

Howard: "That provision it seems has been removed from the Bill..."

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Bost: "Right. So... so, that you..."

Howard: "So now it is..."

Bost: "So you can still purchase a BB gun? Hold on, just a minute. Mr. Chairman, can we kind of get... I'm trying... you know..."

Speaker Hannig: "Could I ask the Gentleman in the middle of the aisle there..."

Bost: "I know there's a lot of conversations going on around the room, but I think this is pretty important that we pay attention to this. You know, we... we defeated a Bill similar to this because we realized the problems that existed with Now... now all of a sudden, we've got... we do have the chance that someone could be in the rural areas and the areas where, you know, pretty commonly, children do use BB guns. Matter of fact, as we talked about in the last Bill that the ... we even have a Christmas program that's kind of written about a young boy coming into his own and having his BB gun. Now, if all of a sudden from what I can tell of this language, he fires that BB gun and it ricochets off or hits someone. Now all a sudden that young man/young woman is charged with aggravated assault. Now I think that under existing laws if somebody is doing this intentionally you can get ag battery right now. I think that falls under existing laws. So I don't think there's any reason that existing... with existing laws we can't do this, but what we're doing is we're endangering young children that accidents can happen and now all of a sudden we're going to ... can you tell me why we're doing it?"

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

- Howard: "We are sort of unclear about what the question is at this point. Would you please repeat it?"
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Bost, could you repeat your question."
- Bost: "Okay. I'm sorry, I didn't hear her answer."
- Howard: "We are unclear as to the question that you're asking."
- Bost: "I'm asking, why are we doing this if you can already be charged with ag battery if something is really aggressive, but now all of a sudden what you're going to do is, you're going to make it to where accidental ricochets whatever with these small guns can all of a sudden put you in a situation where you can be charged. And I think that we have a problem with that. Can you pull it out of the record until we kinda figure out where this is at? I mean, it just kinda came out pretty quick and..."
- Howard: "Yes, we can do that. Please, Mr. Speaker, pull it out of the record."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay. So, we'll take the Bill out of the record at the request of the Sponsor and see if we can find some clarity. Representative Stephens, you have Senate Bill 82. Representative Stephens. Out of the record. Representative Brosnahan on Senate Bill 121. You wish us to read that Bill? 121. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Senate Bill 121."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 121, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Brosnahan."
- Brosnahan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 121, in 2005 this Legislative Body

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

passed legislation and I was the Chief House Sponsor at the time. It was eventually signed into law that required juveniles who were found guilty of sex offenses, they were then required to register with the adult sex offender registry when the juvenile reached the age of seventeen When (17).we passed that legislation we did not distinguish between sexual predators and those juveniles that were convicted of far less serious crimes. And I think what we found out over the last couple of years is that this one-size-fits-all approach just did not work. It resulted in a number of cases that resulted in unfairness quite So what we've done, is we've worked on this legislation for quite a while. I know Representative Annazette Collins has been involved on this issue. worked with the State's Attorneys Office and what we've come up with is this language here in Senate Bill 121, this is actually the language from the Cook County State's Attorneys I think this language strikes a balance between Office. public safety, protecting the rights of juveniles and also the issues revolving around juveniles and privacy. What Senate Bill 121 does is a number of things. It requires the adjudicated juvenile sex offender to register for a minimum period of time. If the juvenile is convicted of a misdemeanor offense, after two (2) years of registration the juvenile can then petition the court to terminate the registration. If a juvenile is convicted of a felony offense, he can petition the court after a period of five (5) years to terminate the registration. But it's up to a court to decide whether it should be terminated.

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

giving some of this discretion back to the judges. The court, upon hearing on the petition for termination of registration, can terminate the registration if the court finds that the registrant poses no risk to the community by a preponderance of the evidence based upon certain factors. And what this Bill also does it removes a provision requiring juveniles who turn seventeen (17) to register on the adult registry. The worst defenders, they're going to be tried as adults and will be receiving adult sentences, will still be included on the adult registry if they're being prosecuted under the automatic transfer laws. also a number of situations where the prosecutors can actually ask for or petition that a juvenile be tried as an adult when they're thirteen (13) or fourteen (14) years old and also this would apply to them as well. And I'd be happy to answer any questions. I know of no opposition to this legislation. No one testified against it in committee and no one has come to me in opposition either. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hannig: "This is on Short Debate. And in response, the Lady from Cook, Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."

Mulligan: "Representative, this is a tough Bill to carry I know, so… and you went through all the list and half the people kept right on doing their business. So the bottom line here is, is there several layers of oversight into who would actually have to register and who wouldn't?"

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Brosnahan: "Right now, the way the law is, if you're a juvenile and you're convicted of a sex offense, whether it would be for a misdemeanor or it would be for a felony, you would have to register once you reach the age of seventeen (17) with the adult registry. And that's what we've said, we said this one-size-fits-all approach isn't working, it's kind of... results in some unfairness issues, so what we're saying is, they're not going to be required when they reach the age of seventeen (17) to automatically register with the adult registration. What we're saying is, if they're tried as an adult, whether it's the result of an automatic transfer case or if the court or if the prosecutor petitioned the court and asked that person to be tried and as an adult, then it would apply to them, but we're just not saying blanket that if you're a juvenile convicted of a sex offense that you have to register at seventeen (17)."

Mulligan: "You are a lawyer, I can tell. I've supported similar Bills in the past and I'd like to do it again for the simple reason that we sit here year after year sponsoring Bills so everybody looks tough on crime. And we've layered the laws and made them so complex that what happens is in order to get the real bad people we mix up people that are fine and the laws for juvenile sex offenders seem to be the same as the laws for adult sex offenders. Once you register as a sex offender and we've made this very, very clear, your life is really screwed up. There's no way of gettin' around it. You are marked, you are on the Internet, and it's different if you are a juvenile sexual predator who's going to be an adult sexual predator, who we want to register or someone

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

that is falsely convicted or caught up in a situation where a particular state's attorney in a particular jurisdiction charges them with something that not only hurts them as a juvenile but impedes them having a life of any kind, I would say, as an adult. So I think this is fair. I think the only problem in voting for it that a lot of people have is they don't want to be characterized as letting a sexual predator run free without watching them. So what. The only question I was really asking is, there are layers, this is not like they automatically don't have to register, someone scrutinizes the actual crime and then decides who registers and who doesn't, is that correct?"

Brosnahan: "That's correct."

Mulligan: "So in other words, what we're trying to do is not lessen the laws that we passed which I think in some ways are appropriate and other ways make things happen that we don't... there are unintended consequences. And so what we're trying to do is make sure that a young person who may be caught up in a bad way of being convicted has an alternative before their life is totally ruined. And yet the person who may be a problem as they enter being an adult is still... has oversight."

Brosnahan: "That's correct."

Mulligan: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Lindner."

Lindner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."

Lindner: "Did you work with the Sex Offender Management Board at all on this legislation?"

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Brosnahan: "I did not. I worked with the State's Attorneys
Office. I believe they had discussions with the Sex
Offender Management Board, but I personally did not."

Lindner: "Okay. But you think that the Sex Offender Management Board was involved in this legislation?"

Brosnahan: "I... I believe they were, Pat, but I can't say that with certainty because I wasn't involved in those discussions but I believe they were."

Lindner: "Okay. There's a Federal Law that has come down on tiered registration. Is this in the Federal Law at all, on juveniles?"

Brosnahan: "I... I think if you're referring to... I think it's the...
the Adam Walsh Act, I believe."

Lindner: "Yes."

Brosnahan: "I believe that goes into effect, I want to say 2009.

And I think that is more strict than this legislation, is my understanding."

Lindner: "Does that... does that address the juvenile situation?"

Brosnahan: "It does."

Lindner: "All right."

Brosnahan: "That deals with the juveniles as well, yes."

Lindner: "Okay. I will say that we held a number of hearings this summer on sex offenders and on registration and this was one of the main problems that we always talked about was the juvenile registration and I think it does need to be addressed by... at a certain point and for certain crimes having a judge look at the registration. Does this also address what is commonly known as the Romeo and Juliet type situation?"

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Brosnahan: "Yes, it does. And I know in Cook County, I believe, they don't even charge those Romeo and Juliet type of cases where there is consensual sex among minors, but this Bill does address that situation because it gives more discretion to the judges and they wouldn't automatically be required to register once they reach the age of seventeen (17) which is the way the law is presently today. So it does address that situation."

Lindner: "And that's good. During our sex offender hearings, that was one of the main problems that everybody wanted us to address and that the committee felt that we should address. So thank you for bringing this legislation. I think it's good legislation."

Brosnahan: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Sacia."

Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "To the Bill."

Sacia: "Ladies and Gentlemen, in committee I voted 'no' on this legislation. I did it for a variety of reasons, however, having had an opportunity to thoroughly analyze the Bill and with the comments of the previous speaker referring specifically to the Romeo and Juliet type crimes, I think the best part of this legislation is it removes that requirement that someone who commits a similar crime as a juvenile must register once they become an adult. This is good legislation. I applaud you, Representative Brosnahan, for bringing it forward, and I think there's many of us in here that have this feeling that if you vote 'yes' on this Bill you're going to be viewed as soft on crime. Quite to

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

the contrary. You should be viewed as having a good solid basis for recognizing good legislation and again, I think this is a good piece of legislation that will address some real inequities in some of these so-called, again, Romeo and Juliet type crimes. And I applaud you, Sir, for bringing it forward. I intend to vote 'yes'."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Brosnahan to close."

Brosnahan: "I just want to tell the Members I appreciate their comments. We worked very long and hard on this issue. And I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Representative Lindner, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 76 voting 'yes' and 40 Bill, having received a voting 'no'. And this Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Brosnahan, you have Senate Bill 143. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 143, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Brosnahan."

Brosnahan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 143 amends the School Code and requires nonpublic, private elementary and secondary schools to conduct an authorized fingerprint-based criminal hestry... criminal history records check on all of their certified and noncertified employment applications

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

after July 1, 2007 and also check the statewide sex offender database for all applicants after July 1, 2007 in order for that school to obtain nonpublic school recognition status. In committee there were a number of concerns addressed by some of the Members, worried that this was going to be taking money and giving it to the private schools. With this legislation there's no money attached to it. It's subject to appropriation. I don't know of any opposition to this legislation. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hannig: "This is on Short Debate. And in response, the Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "To the Bill."

"This legislation is subject to appropriation as was Eddy: mentioned and I also want to state that Representative Brosnahan worked with us to clarify one important fact and that is that although school districts, public school districts, currently do not receive the reimbursement for background checks, there is a line item that would allow for them to also receive if it were funded. And hopefully, working together we can make sure that these types of mandates which are placed on school districts will some day be funded in those line items for those districts affected. This is something that I believe to be fair. It's something that we are mandating on school districts, both public and private and for that reason, I strongly support the Gentleman's Bill and hope that everyone will vote 'yes' to establish that line item and more importantly, I hope every

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

one will make it a priority to fund that line item for both public and private schools in the future. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any further discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in further... all in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Turner, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes' and 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative May, you have House... Senate Bill 158. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 158, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative May."

May: "Yes, thank you, Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 158 amends the Liquor Control Act. For a parent or guardian who knowingly permits his or her residence to be used and someone is drinking under age that if it results in great bodily harm it would escalate from a misdemeanor charge to a Class IV felony. There are exceptions for religious observations and holidays. It's proposed... it's supported by DIAGEO, by Illinois State Police, the Jewish Federation of Illinois, the Secretary of State, MADD, the City of Highland Park, and the Highland Park Police Department, LEED, and other antidrinking and antidrug groups."

Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. And in response, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Fritchey."

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Fritchey: "Thank you, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Fritchey: "Representative, one question. As it... with respect to the issue of 'knowingly', under the analysis it says, 'that a person's deemed to permit his residence to be used in violation of the law, if the parent or guardian knowingly authorizes, enables or permits the use of alcohol or fails to control access to alcohol in the residence.' I'm not being facetious when I say this, is this almost akin to a trigger lock law where a parent tells their child that they can have friends over but the liquor cabinet doesn't have a lock on it or is not properly secured or is not out of the reach of a group of high school kids? You know... here obviously, it's a clear situation if the parents tell their kids to have a party and go buy a keg for them or if they know that their kids are going to bring kegs over or something along those lines. But if the parents say to their child or children, sure you can have some friends over and they have no expectation that those kids would be drinking at the party, but it turns out that there was a case of liquor down in a box in the basement that wasn't secured or there's a liquor cabinet that isn't locked up. As I'm reading the analysis, that would be a knowing violation of the law. Is that how you read this?"

May: "I... you know, you certainly are a fine lawyer and know how these terms are defined in the law, but I don't think that that would be knowingly. I think that if certainly you were right, if you bought a keg, if you were home and you really didn't pay attention at all, I believe that that would. I

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

don't believe it would at all matter that you had alcohol in the house and it wasn't locked up. That's certainly not the intent."

Fritchey: "Bear with me for one second, if you would. 'Cause I'm actually... when all else fails for you read the Bill. And I'm looking at this. Speaker, are there other people waiting to ask questions? Are there other people waiting to ask questions? Would I have the opportunity to come back to me so I don't delay everybody?"

Speaker Hannig: "We'll let Representative Reboletti speak for a while and we'll come back and give you a couple three (3) minutes."

Fritchey: "That'd be plenty. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay? Okay. So. Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

May: "Yes. Um, hum."

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Reboletti: "Representative, this says there was an incident in Deerfield. Is that your district?"

May: "Yes."

Reboletti: "Can you explain to the House what happened there?"

May: "Yes. Oh... oh... okay. I was looking to see who I was speaking to. Yes. There was a home party where the parents bought alcohol for the teens. It was at homecoming and two (2) students died. And actually, right before, there was also an alcohol-related teen death in Highland Park. We're all aware of a very similar incident in Oswego. But in this case, the parents did buy... buy alcohol. So what has changed here really is just the... if there is great bodily harm, and

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

- that's the trigger, that then it changes from a Class A misdemeanor to a Class IV felony. And it sounds horrible, but it just really means that they are facing higher fines and they could go to prison. This is a serious offense."
- Reboletti: "Representative, what happened in that case? Were the parents charged with misdemeanors or did they go to jail? Were they..."
- May: "They're... it's still working it's way through the courts.

  They were charged with several misdemeanors."
- Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. This situation happened in my district last year, same type of situation. A family allowed children to attend the party. They served minors and one of the children went out into a busy street and laid down and was run over by two (2) different vehicles. I think the Lady has a very good Bill. And I'd also ask to be a cosponsor to your Bill and support your legislation."
- Speaker Hannig: "So, Representative Fritchey, would you like to continue your line of questioning?"
- Fritchey: "Real briefly and I appreciate it, Speaker. Obviously, it's... the idea's a good one. Obviously, it's going to come flying out of here. I'm... I'm... Representative, I'm right though. There on page seven (7) of the Bill, beginning in line twenty-two (22), this says, 'that a parent or guardian is deemed to knowingly permitted his or her residence to be used in violation of this Section if they knowingly authorize, enable, or permit such use to occur by failing to control either access to the residence or the alcoholic liquor maintained in the residence.' Where I'm going is this, a lot, of times good laws come out of bad

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

situations. This is a good intentioned law coming out of a terrible situation. I'm telling you that we are going to put innocent parents at jeopardy here, because the way that this legislation is written, if they permit access to their home with nothing but the purest of intentions and a kid happens to get access to a bottle that's in the back of a pantry cabinet somewhere, this statute reads that because that liquor was not essentially secured that those parents are liable for anything that may happen there. I don't want to be seen as voting against this Bill. I do want to be on the record, I guess for lack of a better way of saying I told you so. Collectively folks, we need to pay attention. You didn't write this Bill and I know that and I'm not faulting the folks down at LRB. This legislation is going to set up a innocent person for criminal charges here. Nobody wants to see kids drinking, nobody wants to see the aftermath of a party. My daughter's not that many years away from when she'll be attending these parties. But at the same time to penalize a parent that has no reasonable expectation that this could occur in their house may not be the route that we want to go. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Watson."

Watson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Watson: "Representative... and I have a lot of respect for the previous speaker and he does know his business, so I guess my point is, if that's not your intent why can't we wait and just get it right?"

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

May: "Yes if I could answer. I think that putting the word 'knowingly' in. This is put... just the one word 'knowingly'.

And I certainly respect Representative Fritchey also, but by putting the word 'knowingly' was the protection to show the intent of the Bill that the parent had to knowingly. And while he read that Section, only the... only the penalty was changed and the word 'knowingly'. So I believe inserting the 'knowingly', which the Senator did, tried to address that concern."

Watson: "But if Representative Fritchey still has concerns, don't you think we should... I mean, so you're basically saying he's wrong?"

May: "I'm not saying he's wrong at all, I have great respect for him. I think that adding..."

Watson: "But you're... but you're going to go forward with the Bill without addressing his concern?"

May: "I believe that the Senate approved it overwhelmingly. It came out of committee overwhelmingly. I... I don't know, Representative Fritchey do you have a way to fix it? I don't... I think it's maybe just that he has concern, but I think the word 'knowingly' was intended to take away that concern."

Watson: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Any further discussion? Then Representative May to close."

May: "Yeah..."

Speaker Hannig: "This is Representative May."

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

May: "Okay, you know what. I guess... there are a couple of questions. Could I take it out of the record while we discuss that 'knowingly'?"

Speaker Hannig: "Okay."

May: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Why don't we take it out of the record.

Representative Mathias on Senate Bill 319. Representative

Mathias on 319. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 319, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Mathias."

Mathias: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 319 is identical to a Bill that the Majority Leader Currie passed out of this chambers a short time ago, but unfortunately, the Senate has not taken it up. It's the… it creates the Uniform Real Property Electronic Recording Act. I know at the time we had full debate on it and it did pass the chamber here, so I'm asking again for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. Does anyone stand in response? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 7 of the Calendar, under Senate Bills-Third Reading, is Senate Bill 336. Representative Turner. So, out of the

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

record. Representative Mathias, you have Senate Bill 340. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 340, a Bill for an Act concerning aging. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Mathias."

Mathias: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment 2, as you know, becomes the Bill. We discussed it the other day. It really amends the Illinois Act on Aging to change the appointment guidelines for a Community Care Program Advisory Committee within the Department of Aging. And I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. Does anyone stand in response? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Chapa LaVia and Bradley, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, I'm advised that on Senate Bill 336 that the Sponsor wishes us to return that to the Order of Second Reading. So, return Senate Bill 336 to Second Reading. And going down the list, Representative Mathias, you have Senate Bill 345. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 345, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

- Mathias: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If you would recall, Senate Bill 345 was debated not too long ago, last week and Representative Franks had come up with a suggestion to amend it so that the portions of the Bill... it would be mandatory... in other words, the word 'shall' instead of 'may'. I have filed that Amendment. It was added to the Bill on the House Floor. And now I ask for your 'aye' vote, again."
- "This is on the Order of Short Debate. Does Speaker Hannig: anyone stand in response? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes' and 1 And this Bill, having voting 'no'. received Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On Senate Bill 360, Mr. Clerk, I'm advised that we need to return that to the Order of Second Reading at the request of the Sponsor. Representative Riley, you have Senate Bill 374. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 374, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Riley."
  Riley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate
  Bill 374 essentially amends the water... Metropolitan Water
  Reclamation District Act. It'll allow the district to issue
  bonds for the purposes of funding water quality improvement
  projects. No opposition on this Bill. It passed
  unanimously out of the other Body. And I would ask for an
  'aye' vote."

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

- Speaker Hannig: "This is on Short Debate. Does anyone stand in response? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Osterman and Feigenholtz, Dugan and Davis, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Fortner on Senate Bill 376. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 376, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Fortner."
- Fortner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 376 is the Regulation of Phosphorus and Detergents Act. It is identical to the language of House Bill 819, which passed unanimously out of the House and represents the agreement to how we'll be regulating phosphorus and detergents in the future. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. Does anyone stand in response? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Davis, Will Davis, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes' and 0

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative May, you have Senate Bill 382. Representative May, do you wish us to read 382? Out of the record. Representative Jakobsson on Senate Bill 393. Mr. Clerk... No? Out of the record. Representative Jakobsson on 394. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 394, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Jakobsson."

Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 394 amends the Police Training Institute Act, to transfer the oversight of the Police Training Institute from the University of Illinois's Division of Extension Services to the Offices of Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The purpose is to address an audit finding. The U of I initially organized the police training institute under the Extension Services and moved it several years ago to the Office of the Provost and the Chancellor. And this Bill will make the law reflect the U of I's current practices. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. And in response, the Lady from Cook, Representative Monique Davis."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Davis, M.: "Representative, could you explain to us why you feel it's valuable to transfer the training?"

Jakobsson: "The actual training that's being done is not going to change. This has already been moved... transferred to the

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Office of the Provost and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and this is just cleanup to make sure that the law reflects what the university's current practices are. It's just transferring oversight, it's not transferring what's happening or..."

Davis, M.: "So you want to transfer the oversight? I'll tell you what my concern is. I'm going to support your Bill, but my concern is racial profiling that occurs at the university level and the fact that this particular university had a number of incidents of racial profiling. So I was wondering if this new... what reporting mechanism would either increase racial profiling or decrease racial profiling?"

Jakobsson: "I don't think it has any effect on racial profiling,

Representative."

Davis, M.: "You don't think it will have any effect?"

Jakobsson: "No."

Davis, M.: "Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you. I urge an 'aye'... Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Rose."

Rose: "Thank you. To the last comment that was made, this Bill has absolutely nothing to do with racial profiling or the studies. This is to correct an audit finding that would place the Police Training Institute under where it should be, which is the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, whereas right now it's under the Division of University Extension Services at the U of I. It really doesn't make any sense to have it under the Extension Service. It's an academic mission, it should be under the Vice Chancellor for Academics. I want to make sure and I want to be absolutely

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

clear that from the last speaker's comments, it has nothing to do with her concern and is really more of a technical change than anything. And I would ask everyone to vote for it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Dugan."
- Dugan: "Thank you, Speaker. But I just wanted to be recorded on Senate Bill 374. When that vote was taken, my button wasn't working. I'd like to be recorded as an 'aye'."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay. The record will so reflect. Then Representative Jakobsson, you're recognized to close."
- Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This would just transfer the oversight. It's a recommendation of an audit finding.

  And I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Hannig: "So the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'
  All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open.
  Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all
  voted who wish? Representative May and Burke, do you wish
  to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this
  question, there are 116 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And
  this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is
  hereby declared passed. On Senate Bill 395, Representative...
  Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 395, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Will Davis, for what reason do vou rise?"
- Davis, W.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We recently just voted on Senate Bill 376 and I was not recorded. I ask that the

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

record reflect that I would like to recorded as a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "The record will so reflect."

Davis, W.: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "And now, Representative Jakobsson on Senate Bill 395."

Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of Senate Bill 395 amends the courses of study, the House. Special Instruction Article of the School Code to require all state universities to offer safety education instruction for teacher candidates that's appropriate to the grade level of the teaching certificate that's being attained and also this instruction can be provided by specific safety education courses or incorporated into other existing courses. The purpose of this Bill is, again, to address an audit finding. The Illinois State Board of Education ended its mandate for universities to offer courses in safety education in the 1970s, and so the U of I eliminated those courses and included the subject as a component of student teacher ed. And this law will reflect the current practices of the University of Illinois. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "This is on Short Debate. Does anyone stand in response? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Ryg and Mitchell, Mathias, Leitch, Bost, do you wish to be recorded? Have all voted who wish? Representative Mathias, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question,

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

there are 116 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Coulson on Senate Bill 396. Do you wish us to read that Bill, Representative? Representative Coulson on Senate Bill 396. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 396, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Coulson."

Coulson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 396 is similar to House Bill 816 which we passed unanimously and it provides that a child who is eligible for special education reaches the majority age of eighteen (18), rights accorded to the parents are transferred to the child except in cases where the child is determined to be not competent under State Law. And I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

"This is on the Order of Short Debate. Does Speaker Hannig: anyone stand in response? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Majority, is hereby declared Constitutional Representative Golar, you have Senate Bill 446. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 446, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Golar."

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Golar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 446, Grow Your Own Teacher, Grow Your Own Illinois. This Bill defines indirect expenses. It's an Amendment. Has items such as transportation, tutoring, technology and technology support. It's basically a cleanup Bill. I would ask for a favorable 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. Does anyone stand in response? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Mitchell, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes' and 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Fritchey, you have Senate Bill 452. Do you wish us to read that Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 452, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Fritchey."

Fritchey: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the Body. This legislation which came out of the Senate simply provides that no guardian ad litem or legal fees would be assessed against the Department of Human Services Office of the Inspector General. There are similar fee exemptions for the Office of the State Guardian when that office also adds you under the Guardianship and Advocacy Act. We know of no opposition. I'm seeing that the State Bar Association is listed as an opponent. I believe, at the reluctance of

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

speaking for them, that that was more of a conceptual rather than a specific objection. I'd be happy to answer any questions, otherwise I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. Does anyone stand in response? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Lindner on Senate Bill 454. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 454, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady from Kane, Representative Lindner."

Lindner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is an initiative of the Family Lock Section of the Illinois State Bar Association on the Section in disposition of property which talks about setting aside a fund or trust for the support, maintenance, and education of the minor. It also adds physical and mental health."

Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. Does anyone stand in response? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Flowers, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'.

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Chapa LaVia on Senate Bill 473. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 473, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 473 amends the Municipal Code to provide that when a municipality plans to annex unincorporated contiguous land, then part of the school district, it must send notice to school district potential... potentially affected by the proposed annexation. The Bill provides that the notice shall be sent by certified or registered mail at least ten (10) days before any public hearing. Right now in the state we have it so libraries and counties have to do it but there's nothing in there that schools have to provide that." "This is on the Order of Short Debate. Does Speaker Hannig: anyone stand in response? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Soto, McCarthy, Mautino, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. We're moving to page 8 of the Calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading. If you're on page 8, you need to be prepared. Representative Lang, you have Senate Bill 486. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 486, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is a Bill that would provide a mechanism by which residual funds remaining from a class action lawsuit might be disbursed. It provides that half of the funds would go to one or... various eligible organizations that are listed in the statute. And I would ask for your support. I know of no opposition. This is an initiative of the Chicago Bar Association."
- Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. Does anyone stand in response? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Gordon, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read Senate Bill 499."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 499, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Will Davis."
- Davis, W.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 499 simply amends the EDGE Tax Credit Act by allowing applicants for this credit to receive the credit for any full-time employee working for an employee leasing company. Just makes sure that the credit follows the employee."

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. Does anyone stand in response? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."

Black: "Representative, the only question I have about this is where the actual tax credit will go. Does the tax credit remain with the business or would the tax credit go to a company that may be leasing employees to said company?"

Davis, W.: "Could you repeat that for me, Representative?"

Black: "Yeah, if... it clarifies that the EDGE Tax Credit, which I worked very hard on a few years ago, that you can count full-time employees leased from an employee leasing company. Now the EDGE Tax Credit, as you know, goes to the business based on the number of employees and how much they pay those employees. A question has come up that there may be a misunderstanding on the actual Bill that the tax credit that stands for Economic Development for a Growing Economy would revert back to the company that leases the employees rather than the company on-site doing the actual work. Is that a misunderstanding? I just want to make sure that the EDGE Credit stays with the business and it does not accrue, you know, at the site doing the work. That's it's not your intent to let the company that leases the employee to that company would get any of the tax credit."

Davis, W.: "Representative, I believe that is... that your description of that is indeed correct."

Black: "Okay."

Davis, W.: "I believe so."

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Black: "That's what I thought..."

Davis, W.: "Yes, Sir."

Black: "...and I just wanted to make sure because obviously we wouldn't want to penalize somebody who had taken advantage of the EDGE Credit are meeting all the requirements of the EDGE Credit but because they are leasing employees or some of them are leasing employees, that the leasing company would not then come to the State of Illinois and say, 'Well, they're our employees, technically, and we should get the tax credit, not the business.' And that's your understanding that the EDGE Tax Credit would stay with the actual business that located in your district and my district."

Davis, W.: "I believe..."

Black: "Okay."

Davis, W.: "...I may have misstated that in my opening, Representative..."

Black: "I'm sorry, I..."

Davis, W.: "...that the credit shall stay with the business..."

Black: "I'm sorry, I was scrolling through..."

Davis, W.: "...and not follow the employee."

Black: "That's all I'm... was all I was concerned about. Thank you very much."

Davis, W.: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Hannig: "Any further discussion? Representative Davis to close."

Davis, W.: "I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open.

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

voted who wish? Representative Molaro, Mautino, Flider, Bradley, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Hoffman, you have Senate Bill 521. Do you wish us to read the Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 521, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 521 would develop a Juvenile Defender Resource Center as well as a Juvenile Prosecutor Resource Center to study, design, develop and implement a model system for delivery at trial level, defender and prosecuting services for juveniles in the justice system. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. Does anyone stand in response? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Feigenholtz, you have Senate Bill 526. Out of the record. Representative Molaro on Senate Bill 532. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 532, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Molaro."

Molaro: "This was brought to help the pirating of unlawful uses of recordings. And all it does is it gives a tool for prosecutors whereby when they see, you know, seven hundred (700) little movies in somebody's trunk they can actually arrest them and charge them with the unlawful use and they'll be ordered to make restitution for the recording. There was a technical Amendment the Cook County State's Attorneys, Cook County State's Attorneys... all the state's attorneys as well as the Motion Picture Association of America is for the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. Does anyone stand in response? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative... Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Dunn, you have House... Senate Bill 533. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 533, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill increases penalties for those convicted of

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

- driving after having com... well, with a suspended license after having committed aggravated homicide."
- Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. Does anyone stand in response? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Will Davis."
- Davis, W.: "What?"
- Dunn: "I was trying to remember, Will. This Bill increases penalties for those who continue to drive on a suspended license after they have been convicted of a reckless homicide."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Fritchey."
- Fritchey: "Thank you, Sponsor... Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."
- Fritchey: "Representative, just briefly. What's the difference between this and the House Bill that we had dealt with earlier that was substantially similar?"
- Dunn: "The previous House Bill also included aggravated DUI.

  The Department of Corrections felt that the cost to the state would be too high and wanted to limit it to just reckless homicide."
- Fritchey: "So you initially attempted to increase penalties for people driving on a revoked license that resulted from an aggravated DUI, correct?"
- Dunn: "Or reckless homicide."
- Fritchey: "Right. And then the Department of Corrections has said that we don't want to crack down on people driving on

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

licenses revoked because of a aggravated DUI because of the costs involved, correct?"

Dunn: "Because of the cost of imprisoning those people.

Correct."

Fritchey: "And I want to be very clear truly to cover you and to cover all the Members of this Body who are all... we've worked hard on many pieces of legislation to keep individuals involved and remind you, we're not talking about just DUIs. People that have been convicted of aggravated DUIs, they've revoked... they've had their license revoked because of that conviction, they're caught driving nevertheless. You had a good piece of legislation which was stiff in penalties for people convicted of driving on a license revoked because of an aggravated DUI and the department essentially attempted to put a brick on it because the dollars involved in their mind outweighed the lives that we would have potentially saved. Is that correct?"

Dunn: "That is exactly correct, John. And I wish that we did not remove that portion from this Bill. Cracking down on people who continue to drive after they've been convicted of DUI would have added approximately a hundred and three (103) people to our corrections systems on an annual basis, costing the state approximately two and a half million dollars (\$2,500,000) annually. The Department of Corrections does not have that money."

Fritchey: "Did you... did you or did the Senate Sponsor at least try to move this Bill, their objection notwithstanding, in the Senate or would that Bill not be released?"

Dunn: "The senate..."

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Fritchey: "And I'm not trying to put anybody on the spot, I really want to know what happened here."

Dunn: "A Senate Sponsor picked it up on behalf of the Department of Corrections and sat on it until we agreed to remove the DUI portion. Now..."

Fritchey: "Who was that Senate Sponsor?"

Dunn: "Initially, Senator Trotter took sponsorship of the legislation; however, he passed it off to Senator Dillard and Hultgren after it was amended to remove the aggravated DUI."

Fritchey: "After it was amended, but Senator Trotter would not release it without that Amendment being made?"

Dunn: "As I understand it that comes from the Department of Corrections and the Governor's Office."

"All right. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, Fritchey: unfortunately there is going to be a story in the newspapers days from now, weeks from now, months from now, but at some point that somebody got injured or God forbid killed by an individual driving on a revoked license and that license having been revoked because of an aggravated DUI. somebody's going to have to look at the loved ones from that family and tell them that the reason that we did not stiffen penalties on that driver, driving without a revoked... without a legal license because of an aggravated DUI, is because the department in their fine judgment that said the price tag was too high for us to take them off the streets. I hope, Representative, that you'll reflect back when that news story comes, unfortunately, one day and the Members of this Body do too, that the Sponsor of this Bill tried to do the

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

right thing, that this Body in fact did the right thing, that the Senate would not join us in doing the right thing. Obviously, we have to look at the costs involved when we have pieces of legislation like this, but I would submit to you that I don't think any of us could look at the family member of somebody killed by a driver on a revoked license and tell them that we put too high of a price tag on the head of protecting their loved ones. I think it's a terrible thing what happened here. I respect you for trying to get the best out of this that you can, but you had a better Bill the first time."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield."

Reboletti: "Representative, what was the genesis of this Bill?

I'm familiar with it being from DuPage County, but others here might not recall."

Dunn: "There was an accident in my district, a person driving DUI killed four (4) young women late one evening. And..."

Reboletti: "And then... and then he drove again..."

Dunn: "He served his time in prison. Came out of prison, was on probation and had a suspended license and continued to drive."

Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I join Representative Fritchey. The costs on the highways are tremendous and when death tolls that with... with major injuries, massive injuries, and that this is being sent on to the Senate, I think is a shame. This Bill needs to pass. It'll make the highways safer and will send a strong message that we're not

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

going to tolerate people driving on aggravated DUIs, on reckless homicide convictions or any of those other type of offenses."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Dunn to close."

Dunn: "Thank you and I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Flowers, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Lindner on Senate Bill 534.

Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 534, a Bill for an Act concerning property. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady from Kane, Representative Lindner."

Lindner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is cleanup language for the Safe Homes Act, passed the Senate by 57-0. There are no opponents. It was worked on with the Association of Realtors. It generally clarifies the Lock Change Policy for oral lease... oral leaseholder also and talks about tendering keys on the landlord's part and the tenant's part."

Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. Does anyone stand in response? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Flider, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

this question, there are 116 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Hernandez on Senate Bill 545. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Okay. So Representative Hernandez, I've been advised that there's a Floor Amendment that's pending. Did you wish to move the Bill back? So, Mr. Clerk..."

Hernandez: "I wish to move the Bill back to Second Reading to add another Amendment."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. So, Mr. Clerk, move the Bill back to Second Reading and are there any Amendments?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Hernandez, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Hernandez on the Amendment."

Hernandez: "It's a technical change changing 'sexual' to 'other' minorities."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion?"

Hernandez: "And I ask for adoption."

Speaker Hannig: "Then all in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments or Motions."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. So, we'll move this back to Third but we'll hold that 'til tomorrow. Moving on down the list, Representative Coulson, you have Senate Bill 547. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 547, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Coulson."

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

- Coulson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 547 creates a task force on health data. We've worked out an arrangement that will make sure that we can improve collection of health data to increase the quality of health care in the State of Illinois. And I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. Does anyone stand in response? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Rep... Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Phelps on Senate Bill 569. Out of the record. Representative Saviano on Senate Bill 573. Out of the record. Representative Washington on Senate Bill 577. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 577, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Washington."

Washington: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Senate Bill 577... give me one second, I'm sorry, Sir. Senate Bill 577 provides that restricted driving permits may be issued in order for the petitioner to travel to and from drug rehab activities recommended by a driving service provider. Individuals convicted multiple times of driving under the influence, leaving the scene of an accident involving personal injury or reckless homicide, are not eligible for a restricted driving permit. And if a person's license or

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

permit has been revoked or suspended due to two (2) or more convictions for driving under the influence or reckless homicide, where the use of alcohol or other drugs is recited as an element of the offense or similar out-of-state offense or combination of the offenses, that person if issued a restricting driver permit, may not operate a vehicle unless it has been equipped with an ignition interlock device. I ask for favorable support. This legislation is needed to strengthen and also show some flexibility under the Secretary of State law. Secretary of State. Thank you. Any que..."

- Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order... this is on the Order of Short Debate. Does anyone stand in response? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read Senate Bill 580."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 580, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Fortner."
- Fortner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 580, as amended in committee, brings the language identical to House Bill 729 which was passed unanimously. That language will make sure that the Cycle Rider Safety Training Program and those monies as administered by IDOT

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

are kept in that program. House Bill 729 is not moving in the Senate, so I would strongly urge an 'aye' vote on Senate Bill 580."

Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. Does anyone stand in response? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Washington, May, Flider, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 9 of the Calendar, Representative Gordon, you have Senate Bill 585. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 585, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Gordon."

Gordon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is an initiative of Secretary of State, Jesse White. It has to do with the interlock... the ignition interlocks that go on people's cars after they get charged and convicted of driving under the influence of alcohol. This is something that... it's just some clarifying language. They were unable to follow the law because there was some conflict between two (2) of the statutes. It's... it was requested by the Secretary of State. And I would ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. Does anyone stand in response? The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Franks."

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Franks: "Representative, we just passed a Bill a few minutes ago, I think Senate Bill 300. How does this differ than the one we just passed?"

Gordon: "Senate Bill 300 is... was an expansion. It's... it's related as amended, but that would require the use of interlock devices instead of the current procedures that allow the judges to do the sentencing with RDPs and JDPs. So, this is the clarifying... the current language that's already there and Senate Bill 300 is the one that added mandatory provisions for ignition interlocks."

Franks: "All right. So they're complimentary and not duplicative?"

Gordon: "Some... somewhat. I believe in the end the Secretary of State was a proponent of Senate Bill 300."

Franks: "Okay. Thank you."

Gordon: "Yeah."

Speaker Hannig: "Any further discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Verschoore, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read Senate Bill 594."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 594, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady from Grundy, Representative Gordon."

Gordon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is an initiative of Cook County Sheriff, Tom Dart. This would change a Sentencing Code so that if someone is in custody awaiting trial and they commit a crime against a correctional officer or sheriff's employee, aggravated battery, then that sentence that shall be imposed shall be served consecutively to whatever sentence that they may get for what they are in custody for. As I said, this was requested by the sheriff in Cook County and it follows the Sentencing Code in the felony levels as already written in the Criminal Code. And I would ask for your 'aye' vote. It's a clarification."

Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. And in response, the Lady from Cook, Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Mulligan: "Representative, it says served consecutively?"

Gordon: "Right. Yes."

Mulligan: "I'm just trying to think if I misconstrued consecutively."

Gordon: "One right after another."

Mulligan: "All right. So that they would..."

Gordon: "They would finish serving one sentence..."

Mulligan: "...they would not let them out. They would have to serve whatever the penalty is for hitting a correctional officer right after the sentence that was currently imposed.

Is that correct?"

Gordon: "If they're in... For example, if they're in custody on a drug crime, on a Class IV..."

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Mulligan: "I get it, Representative."

Gordon: "Okay."

Mulligan: "I'm just trying to clarify the consecutively part of it. Thank you."

Gordon: "Consecutive is one right after the other, Representative."

Mulligan: "That's fine. I just wanted to make sure that's what you were... in doing what... how you were doing this and I had to look at it for a minute. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Any further discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Feigenholtz, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read Senate Bill 595."

- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 595, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Fulton, Representative Smith."
- Smith: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is an initiative of the AARP and it would allow for the creation of a Medicaid Management Program for individuals age 60 and over. As we all know, oftentimes medication management is one issue that determines whether a senior citizen can stay in their home or not. This would be a program that would be through agreements with the Department

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

on Aging, local case coordination units could manage the program either directly or indirectly through a contract with another community group to help provide management in terms of medication reminders, medication monitoring, set up of medication and storage of medication. This is subject to appropriation. I think while there may be a cost for the program, I think the savings that it would return to the state would be tremendous in terms of allowing senior citizens to stay in their own home... their own homes longer. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hannig: "This Bill is on Short Debate. Does anyone stand in response? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative... Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read Senate Bill 599."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 599, a Bill for and Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Hamos."

Hamos: "Thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is an initiative of the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District. In the year 2003 we gave that district responsibilities for storm water management throughout Cook County. However, the district itself doesn't cover all of Cook County. There are about 7 percent of Cook County that lies outside the district's boundaries and this Bill simply would allow them

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

to charge fees for services, important storm water services, that we require them to provide. That's all this Bill does. It has no opposition as far as I know. The South Suburban Mayors and Managers Association which represents the largest area impacted by this legislation is in full support. Glad to answer any questions."

- Speaker Hannig: "This Bill is on Short Debate. Does anyone stand in response? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Lindner, Mitchell, Wait, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 75 voting 'yes' and 39 And this Bill, voting 'no'. having received a Majority, is hereby declared passed. Constitutional Representative Tyron, you have Senate Bill 612. 612. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 612, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

  Speaker Hannig: "Representative Tryon."
- Tryon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 612 is the companion Bill to a House Bill that we passed unanimously that codifies the ability of townships to have a local recycling program on their property. I think this is a good use of our township facilities. And would urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Hannig: "This Bill is on the Order of Short Debate. Does anyone stand in response? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Tracy and Flowers, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Beiser, you have Senate Bill 627. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 627, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Beiser."
- Beiser: "Yes. House Bill 627 (sic-Senate Bill) 627 amends the Recreation Trails Act of Illinois, and basically what it does it protects this fund from being swept. Be happy to answer any questions, otherwise I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. Does anyone stand in response? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Rep... Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative McAuliffe, you have Senate Bill 639. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 639, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McAuliffe."
- McAuliffe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 639 would allow police or fire vehicles, mainly bicycles, to be able to put sirens on. And I ask for a 'yes' vote and be happy to answer any questions."
- "This is on the Order of Short Debate. Does Speaker Hannig: anyone stand in response? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes' and 0 `no'. And this Bill, having voting received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Coulson, you have Senate Bill 640. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 640, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Coulson."
- Coulson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 640 requires supportive living facilities and assisted living facilities to check the nurses aide registry maintained by the Department of Public Health prior to hiring nurses aides and habilitation aides. There's no such registry requirement currently for assisted living or supportive living facilities. And I would encourage an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. Does anyone stand in response? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Tracy, you have Senate Bill 641. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 641, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady from Brown, Representative Tracy."

Tracy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today I'm presenting Senate Bill 641 which would require comprehensive eye examinations for all children entering kindergarten or first grade. it would be completed by October of each year. I believe that all of us here are aware of the importance of good eye health and identifying vision problems early in children and how important that is to as a... to result in a better education for them. And so I'm asking for an 'aye' vote of this Bill. We had an agreed Bill that was amended from the previous one brought over from the Senate, but it had an agreement between the IFT, the optometrists, the ophthalmologists, the Medical Society, and the School of Management Alliance. And again, I would ask your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "This is on Short Debate, but we'll put it on Standard Debate. And Representative Eddy, you're recognized for 5 minutes."

Eddy: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."

Eddy: "Representative, just for clarification purposes. Is there anything in this Bill that would require a school district to deny a child education because they don't have the eye exam completed?"

Tracy: "There is nothing that would deny a child from being foreclosed from attending school."

Eddy: "Okay. So, at the kindergarten, the second and sixth grade level, we're empowering school districts to require students to have not just vision screening, but an eye examination."

Tracy: "That's correct."

Eddy: "And if a student... there is a date in there as a deadline, but that's not necessarily a date that would require school districts to disallow the student from attending?"

Tracy: "That's correct. The... we thought it best to have a October 15th date for reason that it would identify early in the school year any potential problems. But it does not preclude attendance."

Eddy: "Okay. And finally, I want to commend you on your work on this Bill. There was a lot of concerns from several different organizations regarding the original Bill and especially to the point of whether or not students would be disallowed from attending. You did a lot of work on it, you met several times with those groups and I think what we have here is something that is going to improve the process that we have to go from vision screening to vision eye exams, which we all agree are very important for kids especially in those young grades when being able to see the work and

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

especially in the kindergarten and second grade. We need to catch these things early to help kids who are having trouble learning. Oftentimes it just has to do with their eyes. And I commend you for your work on it and I strongly support this and urge everyone to vote 'aye' on this legislation. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Lyons in the Chair. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Miller. Representative David Miller."

Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Sponsor... thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Indicates she will."

Miller: "As far as the penalty phase, Representative, I just wanted you to elaborate on that for just a minute for clarity for the Body. Will the school be penalized if the child is in noncompliance?"

Tracy: "The school will not be penalized."

Miller: "Well... well then, what enforcement mechanism will be applicable in this situation?"

Tracy: "Well, they'll be a reporting mechanism from the schools but the only penalty, if that... if it could be phrased as that, is that a school might retain a child's report card, much as they do with the dental exam."

Miller: "So, it's up to the discretion of the school. The ideal is not to really penalize the school or the child but just to really encourage an eye exam?"

Tracy: "Right. We do believe that once the parents are aware that, you know, and think through the process of how much

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

- this could mean to your child's education, that they will certainly want to conform and get the eye examination."
- Miller: "Statistically, do you have any rationale on why we should be doing this?"
- Tracy: "Well, it was an initiative of the teachers because they have seen... I think all of us here know that probably two-thirds of this room has some kind of eye enhancement or vision problem and the earlier we identify it the better that a child can learn. And I think that the teachers very much knew and have identified that a learning disorder or any kind of vision problem can be overcompensated... compensated for by the student and that this very much enhances their ability to learn to identify it early."
- Miller: "Why did you pick the particular grades? I know it's in conjunction with the dental examination it was a very specific reasons: eruption of primary teeth, eruption of first molars, in regards to a dental. Why these grades for an eye examination?"
- Tracy: "Well, I think it's very much recommended by all optical groups that you start at the very earliest. It's even recommended by the Lions Foundation that you identify eye exam... or you start eye examinations at the age of three (3) for a child, so certainly kindergarten which would be five (5) or first grade which would be age six (6) is at the onset of learning process."
- Miller: "All right. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I would like to commend the Sponsor of this legislation. When we start to look at total health care of children or anybody you have to often... dentistry is often overlooked and also eye

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

examination. We expect our children to perform on these tests and when we look at No Child Left Behind, we look at just being productive in everyday society and the eyes are often overlooked. This is a way in which we can provide early intervention, provide the proper needed treatment, and really to treat our children in the way any of us need to be treated as adults. I would ask for favorable votes."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Rosemary Mulligan."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Mulligan: also. The only thing I'd like to be stated in there is I think that if you go to have your child's eyes examined, and from what I understand from my doctors I've talked to in the past several years, to do a color-blind test takes only a minute or two (2) more. Many schools teach by color coding. When my son entered first grade we did not know that they were teaching reading using a color coding program. didn't find out until in fifth grade that he was color blind. You know, this is a hampering to small children. I've had other constituents come to me with this same problem. Particularly when you start off in kindergarten one of the things they do is, can a child identify the colors? Well, it's pretty hard to identify colors if you're color blind. And so it's only a matter of showing them a couple little charts in part of the vision screening to include a test for color blindness which is a big issue in school, particularly if your school happens to be using any methods that include color coding or basing a child's readiness or progressiveness to pass on, and whether they

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

know their colors and what they're doing. So I think it's a simple part to put that and a good eye exam should contain that in it. I think this is a really big issue and not only can the child see but if they're color blind and that there's other issues that go along with either learning disabilities or things that involve the eye, which I think are really important. So I'm glad the Sponsor has this Bill out there. I hope that it will include it. We've tried to suggest this in the past but there's been no compulsory reason for doing it. I think it's a really good Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Will Davis."

Davis, W.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lyons: "Indicates she will."

"Representative, when you are... had this Bill in Davis, W.: committee... First of all, let me just say that I think you have an excellent Bill, I do plan to support the Bill because I think we all know the correlation with some children when they're not ... when they can't see the board, they have trouble learning and then that leads to other things because we think maybe they are in need of special education or a number of other things. But so, if they're given eye exams, we can figure out what their issues are in terms of being able to see the chalkboards and we can move down the road with that. But one of my concerns was, and I suggested this in committee and I'd just like you to engage me in this dialogue for the benefit of the ... everyone in the House was, if we're requiring this type of exam and we find out that obviously children have trouble seeing and are in

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

need of glasses, what are the mechanisms in place to try to help low-income children to receive discounted glasses, free glasses, whatever the case may be? If you said this earlier, I do apologize if I'm being a little redundant, but you know, can you just share with us what's available or how you... how this Bill can help to try to further those efforts and address those issues?"

"Certainly. From the very beginning, the cost of the eye Tracy: examination and how it would be handled by parents as well as if eye problems were actually identified, that how would be addressed. And the All Kids Insurance Program includes this type of eye examination and then of course, remedial eye glasses as well. And the opticians... the optometrists and a lot of the ones that will be joining in this, put together a very affordable package that they're going to try to make as much statewide as possible. So with that, we thought it was very... the initial examination would be not an obstacle for any parent. Also, the Lions Foundation has been very active in funding eye glasses. And we contacted them very early on they will continue to do the eyeglasses and they're very interested also in the eye examinations and they're going to take a look at that, but for the time being they are committed to try to make the glasses very affordable or bought for the children."

Davis, W.: "Thank you. Just one other question. Unlike other countries that... a country that I've had the pleasure of visiting where we have... where they have universal health care and it's not an application process for a family to enroll in their health programs, we have an application

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

process for those programs that we have here in the state. So is it possible, and I'm not asking you to necessarily amend your Bill, but if a child sees an optometrist and if it's recognized that maybe they are from a low-income area and... and... is it possible that the optometrists or those health officials can also disseminate information about All Kids or give that information to children so that if the child is not enrolled they can give that information to their parents? I mean, is there something that we can encourage those health professionals to do, that would... so we can up the enrollment to make sure that young people are on All Kids so that if they are eligible they can receive the benefits that you just spoke of?"

Tracy: "Certainly. I'm not sure that they don't already, I mean, they'd be very interested in making sure their services were paid for, so I can imagine that would be a part of it."

Davis, W.: "Well, certainly if you can encourage that, that..."

Tracy: "Sure."

Davis, W.: "...I think that would go a long way in trying to making sure that children and their families can take advantage of our... of the existing health programs that we have here in the State of Illinois. Thank you very much."

Tracy: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Tracy to close."

Tracy: "I wanted to mention that Representative Mulligan's comments about the color vision screening was very important and as I have learned in visiting with the ophthalmologists and the optometrists, a comprehensive eye examination

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

conducted by these individuals does include the color screening as well. And I think this would be a very good Bill to enhance education and I would certainly ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should Senate Bill 641 pass?'
All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 116 Members voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative John Bradley, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Bradley, J.: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed, Representative."

Bradley, J.: "I just want to let the esteemed Body know that today, May 29, 2007, we welcome professional baseball, the Southern Illinois Miners, to southern Illinois. It's a great day for southern Illinois and we're very proud of it."

Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Representative. Representative Tracy, you're up again with Senate Bill 649. Read the Bill Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 649, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "The Lady from Brown, Representative Jil Tracy."

Tracy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 649 amends the Motor Fuel and Petroleum Standards Act and provides that language about labeling will be placed on retail motor fuel dispensing devices concerning information about biodiesel

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

when it contains at least 2 percent. The label requirement basically is that there will be a capital B placed on the pump along with the number following immediately behind that as to what the percentage of biodiesel is. And I would urge an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should Senate Bill 649 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 116 Members voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Will Davis has Senate Bill 654. Read the Bill Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 654, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Will Davis."
- Davis, W.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before I begin, let me just acknowledge that the Senate Sponsor of the Bill is joining me on the floor right here to my right, Senator Mattie Hunter. Senate Bill 654 simply creates the Diabetes Initiative Act and provides that the Department of Human Services shall develop a strategic plan to slow the rate of diabetes as a result of obesity and other environmental factors by the year 2010. The Bill also provides that the department shall deliver that plan to the General Assembly

63rd Legislative Day

- as well as the Governor on or before December 31 of 2008. Be more than happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should Senate Bill 654 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 116 Members voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on page 665, Representative Schock has... on page 9, Senate Bill 665. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 665, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Aaron Schock."
- Schock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 665 (sic-Senate Bill) simply expands the present law that allows school districts to videotape on school buses, to also record the audio tape. The same rules apply as far as who can obtain this information. I'd be happy to answer any questions. Would urge a 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should 665 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 116 Members voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional

63rd Legislative Day

- Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Coulson, you have Senate Bill 671. Out of the record. Representative Currie for a Motion."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. I move to suspend the posting requirement so that the following measures may be heard soon, and that would be Senate Bills 380, 764, 1314, House Bills 2584; Senate Bill 13, Senate Bill 68, Senate Bills 774 and 797, and 829, 835, 996, 1014, 1041, 1132, 1424; and House Resolutions 375, 384, 385, 391, 396 and 7 (sic-397) and 8 (sic-398), 406, 412, 13 (sic-413) and 14 (sic-414), 416, 424, 426, 429, 436, 439, 450, 451, 457, 459; House Joint Resolutions 55, 60, 61, 64, 65, 66 and 67. I know of no opposition to the Motion and I'd appreciate your support."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Currie moves to suspend the posting requirement on those matters. Seeing no objection the Attendance Roll Call... all those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed 'no'. The Motion is carried. Ladies and Gentlemen, we'll continue on page 10 of the Calendar, Senate Bills-Third Reading. Representative Osmond has Senate Bill 680. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 680, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Lake, Representative JoAnn Osmond.
- Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 680 requires electric providers to offer net metering to any retail customer that operates a renewable energy system generating no more than 2000 kilowatts. provides that the customer may

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

use an existing meter or may obtain one from a utility. Sets forth procedures for determining billing amounts for customers generating power. This is an agreed Bill as amended and I believe there's no opposition. I'll be happy to answer any questions."

- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should Senate Bill 680 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Flowers. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 116 Members voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on page 10 of the Calendar, Representative Bob Flider has Senate Bill 682. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 682, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Bob Flider."
- Flider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 682 is an initiative of the Secretary of State's Office. It's effectively cleanup legislation. Amends the Illinois Vehicle Code by making several changes to bring them into compliance with the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Development Act of '99. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should Senate Bill 682 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 116 Members voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Ed Washington, you have Senate Bill 684. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 684, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Lake, Representative Ed Washington."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 684 is... Before I go into this Bill, I want to say this is an agency that I was blessed to serve for four (4) years as one of its trustees and Senate Bill 684 really brings us up to time, because it amends the North Shore Sanitary Act to provide that the board of trustees of the district should have the authority to change the name of the district by ordinance, and so now we join the others in asking to be called the North Shore Water Reclamation District, currently, the name of the North Shore Sanitary District. And I'm proud to say that this is the second biggest sanitation water reclamation district in the state, and I'm also proud to say, it's probably one of the most modern. I mean, they are second to none in terms of technology, that's why the bills have been so low for the residents because they have always been right on the cutting edge and made good healthy decisions in terms of investments of the taxpayer's money. The proposed Bill, it would also increase the amount of compensation for the

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

board members. In comparison to other places the maximum the president of the board will receive, fourteen thousand (14,000) which is now eleven thousand (11,000). Maximum for the members of the trustees will go from eleven (11,000)... from eight (8,000) to eleven (11,000) per year. I ask for favorable consideration. We have not sought an increase in trustees' time that they put in for fourteen (14) years. So, I'm asking for support in the change to bring us up to speed and up to date. Thank you."

- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is 'Should Senate Bill 684 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Fritchey. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 54 Members voting 'yes'... Representative Washington?"
- Washington: "Thank you. My light was flashing. I would like to take this Bill out of the record for Postponed Consideration. Postponed Consideration. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, put this Bill on Postponed Consideration. On page 10 of the Calendar, Representative Ruth Munson has Senate Bill 688. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 688, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Ruth Munson."
- Munson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 688 is supported by the Mobile Home Tenants Association and manufactured housing industry. While it doesn't address the rent issues, it does introduce

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

several new measures to protect residents in manufactured home communities. First and foremost it puts teeth into the current Mobile Home Park Act. I will answer any questions and ask for your 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion on Senate Bill 688? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should Senate Bill 688 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Rose. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 115 Members voting 'yes' and 1 person voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Reboletti. Representative Durkin has Senate Bill 711. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 711, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jim Durkin."
- Durkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 711 was brought to me by the DuPage State's Attorneys Office. What they're seeking to do is they make a procedural change in the Code of Criminal Procedure under the joinder of defendants and offenses by allowing in one charge instrument to have multiple defendants to be brought in by satisfying one (1) of the two (2) existing requirements under the existing qualifications for joinder of offenses and defendants. What has happened is this is a result of a number of situations which they've seen where people have put together bogus

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

types of raffles, mainly on behalf of veterans and they've turned out to be scams and rip-offs. So when the individuals who've been taken for the fifty (\$50.00) or seventy-five dollars (\$75.00), have to be charged individually as opposed to being brought in collectively, as one group. So I would ask for favorable support of this Bill."

- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing not, the question is, 'Should Senate Bill 711 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Myers. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 116 Members voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared Mr. Clerk, on page 10 of the passed. Calendar, Representative Jakobsson has Senate Bill 729. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 729, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Lady from Champaign, Representative Jakobsson."
- Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 729 provides that all campus media produced primarily by students at a state-sponsored institution of higher education is a public forum for expression by the student journalists and editors at that particular institution. It provides that the campus media, whether it's campus-sponsored or noncampus-sponsored, is not subject to prior review by public officials of those

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

institutions; provides that collegiate student editors of campus media are responsible for determining the news, opinions, feature content and advertising content of campus media. This does have exceptions for teaching professional standards of grammar and journalism. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Is anyone seeking recognition on Senate Bill 729? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Bill Black."

Black: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lyons: "She indicates she will."

"Representative, I remember in committee we had asked... I'm not... I don't recall that we got a definitive answer. I don't have any problems basically with the underlying Bill. But let's say a student newspaper or a student-run radio station deviates from the norm, goes way out on a limb and as a result of that gets sued. My concern is at what point would the school... now, I know like the Daily Illini is set up separately, but that's not the way it is in many college campuses. I'm just trying to make sure, at what point in this process would the tax-supported university be In other words, where is the firewall between protected? the potential abuse... that's the wrong word. If a student newspaper or radio station just goes bananas, uses words that are no longer acceptable, kind of like the Don Imus situation. I... I just want to make sure there's some safequard so that the public taxpayers don't end up footing a multimillion dollar judgment that might be levied against a student newspaper or broadcast station that just did,

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

printed, said something that was so outrageous that a rather large lawsuit would be filed."

Jakobsson: "This Bill... it does not prohibit... I'm sorry. It's not... it does not protect obscenity. So the university or the school can still stop the student from publishing obscenities and things as you called, 'way far out on the limb'."

Black: "Now, that's... that's not exactly what I'm after. Ιf you'll recall in committee, I asked, where the protection? I know it doesn't it doesn't set up, doesn't tell journalists what they can do, what they can't do except within the broad parameters of the profession. But let's just say for whatever the reason, a student publication, radio station, or in some cases a television station, for whatever the reason, just goes berserk over a certain issue. And they call people names that are no longer acceptable, they, in fact, do deal with obscenity, they insinuate that there's extramarital activity, in fact, that they dumped their wife and ran off with a donkey or something. At what point is the institution protected? And I... I think student journalists should learn and I think they should have that freedom. I'm just trying to make sure we don't get ourselves in a situation where a school is sued to the point where if it's a K-12, they have to use their Tort Liability Fund or if it's a university, they may have to come to the General Assembly to indemnify a multimillion dollar judgment."

Jakobsson: "Well, for one thing, K-12 is not affected by this Act at all so that would be not even addressed by what

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

you're discussing. And the schools... this doesn't change when schools can be sued and when they can't be."

Black: "Well, Representative, I mean, I'm not trying to do anything funny with the Bill. This is the same question I asked in committee and I assumed we would have an answer by now. There... all I'm worried about is that in the case of an egregious breakdown of common sense or journalistic integrity, that there is a huge lawsuit filed, the individual student journalists are not going to be indemnified, they're not going to have multimillion dollar insurance policies, where is the firewall between public funds and a lawsuit that might result from a collegiate journalistic endeavor?"

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Black, your time has expired. We'll give you another minute to finish your question. Representative Jakobsson."

Black: "I... Mr. Speaker, I don't know what to say. I'm just trying to get an honest answer that has been brought to me by people in my district. I support the basic Bill. All I want is some indication of how public monies will be protected if a student-run newspaper at one of our colleges or universities does something so egregious that a jury awards a... awards damages to an institution or an individual... say, let's just pick a figure, five million dollars (\$5,000,000). How is the university and the public funds, how are they protected from having to pay that judgment? That's all I'm trying get. I support the underlying Bill. I just want to make sure there's some inherent protection in the case of a huge lawsuit judgment. And I asked this in

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

committee, so it can't come as a surprise, but I don't get an answer."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jakobsson."

Jakobsson: "Campus policy is to assume an expression made by a collegiate student journalist, a collegiate student editor or other contributor, and campus media is not a expression of campus policy. Nothing in the Act prohibits the imposition of discipline for harassment, threats, or intimidation, unless constitutionally protected."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Roger Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for questions?"

Speaker Lyons: "She indicates she will."

Eddy: "Representative, I have some of the same concerns, mine go deeper, but and we discussed this in committee. I have this concern. I remember in committee, the gentleman that was there testifying was there because he had been a coll… he had been the sponsor of a newspaper at a community college who had been dismissed from his position because the administration disa… there was a disagreement over something that was published. And there was a lawsuit, a federal lawsuit that took place, regarding the content that was claimed to be appropriate that the administration said was inappropriate and it kind of came down to who would be in control of ultimately what is published in a state-supported public… state-supported university's paper. This extends it to, as Representative Black mentioned, the radio and television, any media. So our concern is simple. If you

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

take out of the hands of the administrators of these universities and public colleges and community colleges, if you take out of their hands the ultimate decision as to whether or not something is appropriate, the university then become... are they still responsible legally and liability wise for a lawsuit that stems from the inclusion of something that they wish wasn't made available? Is there an immunity clause that's in this legislation that directly releases the university from liability in those cases where, I guess, they're overruled, as to the content of a media message?"

Jakobsson: "We don't have an immunity clause. We do have what I previously responded to, campus policy, expressions made by a collegiate student journalist, collegiate student editor or other contributor, and campus media is not an expression of campus policy."

Eddy: "I understand that, and I understand what you're saying with that. My concern goes deeper, and that is whether or not these universities or community colleges will ultimately be liable because there isn't the immunity clause for something that may get said or may get printed that someone takes offense to. We know that we're not sure what people are offended by now a days. And it can change from day-to-day or week-to-week. My question really gets to what Representative Black states. In those cases, what protects the university, who no longer is going to be responsible for... with the content, because they're going to be overruled here. What protects them from having to defend it? Is there... and I really think we need to have an immunity, a

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

direct immunity, for the university in the legislation to protect them. And that's... that's one part of what I have objection to with this Bill. I have some other objections, but that one certainly is the paramount because this could be multiple lawsuits against universities for something that, you know, someone may have made a wisecrack or a comment that just offended a certain group."

- Jakobsson: "I don't think you can sue just for making, as you refer to, as a wisecrack that I believe would go against that person only. It's all protected by the First Amendment."
- Eddy: "Okay. Let's go beyond that and just say a student outwardly commits slander, makes a slanderous statement. Is there anything in this that would provide immunity from, not just a comment but from actual slander? And Representative, if you want to take it out of the record and show us that kind of language, I think that would alleviate a lot of the fears and then we can, you know, discuss it some more. But that's a fear I think a lot of people in the Body have about the immunity issue for those universities. And maybe it's in there somewhere, we're just not seeing it and staff can help us see it."
- Jakobsson: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, let me take this out of the record."
- Speaker Lyons: "Out of the record. Mr. Clerk, on page 10 of the Calendar, Representative Nekritz has Senate Bill 730. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 730, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

63rd Legislative Day

- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Nekritz."
- Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 730 amends the portion of the Illinois Plumbing Act dealing with installation of lawn irrigation devices. It requires that all automatically operated lawn sprinkler systems installed after January 1, 2009, shall include the technology that prevents the operation of the system when the ground is sufficiently moist from rain. Golf courses and agricultural systems are exempt from Senate Bill 730. These devices can save significant amounts of water and are widely available as well as relatively inexpensive to install. Several states have already passed a similar mandate for the use of these devices. And I ask for your support."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should Senate Bill 730 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Durkin. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there 95 Members voting 'yes', 21 voting 'no'. This Bill. having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on page 10 of the Calendar, Representative Osmond has Senate Bill 744. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 744, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative JoAnn Osmond."

63rd Legislative Day

- Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 744 amends the County Code. Authorizes the state's attorneys in these... in counties under three million (3,000,000) population to charge a fee of ten dollars (\$10) in certain cases when the court enters into an order of supervision. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should Senate Bill 744 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Mitchell, Jerry. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 116 Members voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 10 of the Calendar, Representative Saviano has Senate Bill 745. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 745, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Skip Saviano."
- Saviano: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 745 is an initiative of the Illinois CPA Society. Just straightens out the procedure of out-of-state CPAs practicing here and vice versa. It's an initiative of the CPA Society working with the Department of Professional Financial Regulation. I would ask for its approval. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Kane, Representative Chapa LaVia."

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Chapa LaVia: "Did you say it was agreed by... by all parties?"

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman will yield."

Saviano: "Yes."

Chapa LaVia: "Okay."

Speaker Lyons: "Any further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should Senate Bill 745 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Smith has Senate Bill 746 on page 10 of the Calendar. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 746, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House (sic-Senate) Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Fulton, Representative Mike Smith."

Smith: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This legislation would extend the Technology Immersion Pilot Project for an additional three (3) years. This is a program that we established three (3) years ago, actually longer than that. This is the first year that it has been funded and that's the reason we want to extend it. We were able to get the funding to begin the program and the first schools have received their grant awards. To take you back, the Technology Immersion Pilot Project is a program through the State Board of Education. It is a competitive grant program that would provide laptop computers and software,

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

online courses to participating schools. It is an attempt to do an immersion into technology for those schools. It has been well received by the education community and this simply would extend it for an additional three (3) years, provided, of course, that we have the funding."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Roger Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "He indicates he will."

Eddy: "Representative, this is subject to appropriation?"

Smith: "That's right."

Eddy: "Again? Last time was five million dollars (\$5,000,000) appropriated. Is there a belief or a desire for a similar amount to be appropriated this year?"

Smith: "Actually, Representative Eddy, we have always requested ten million (10,000,000). I think that would be desirable again this year, obviously you know, that's subject to budget negotiations, but at the very least, we'd want to continue the level we've had."

Eddy: "And during committee there were some students in there who spoke to the value of this and certainly was very impressive as to the way that the technology had affected their learning environment and it was something, obviously people would like to see more available. Am I... you know... I don't have a problem with the theory, I wish we could make it available to more and I'm not sure with the budget negotiations the way they are and the fact that we can't probably find money, it doesn't look like at this point for

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

special education reimbursement that we're going to be able to do more than we did. But I'd certainly like to see, if this type of thing continues, more schools have available to them, this type of opportunity for their students."

Smith: "Absolutely. I think that's the ultimate goal of the program to show the success that immersion in technology in the classroom can have on student achievement. And you're right, the students who testified in committee were from the school here in Springfield who received the grant and I think they were very impressive, impressed the committee on what they have been able to do just this semester in using the technology in their programs."

Eddy: "And finally, if it continues in whatever dollar appropriation, the same type of geographic disbursement of the program is what you plan to continue through the State Board of Education so that's it's available throughout the state?"

Smith: "Yes, absolutely. I think geographic diversity is very important for the program to be successful for us to truly get a measure of what can happen with technology immersed in the classroom."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative David Miller."

Miller: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Indicates he will."

Miller: "Representative, what's the availability of opening this up to additional schools? I'm not sure if I heard that or not."

63rd Legislative Day

- Smith: "We haven't changed that with this legislation, Representative Miller. Obviously, you know, funding is key here. We received five million dollars (\$5,000,000) for this program in the current budget. Our hope is that we could expand that to ten million (10,000,000) and obviously with that expand the number of schools that could be served by this."
- Miller: "So you're lookin' at trying to not continue with the same schools or are you looking for additional schools or concurrently keeping those schools and then adding new schools?"
- Smith: "The selection of the schools is done by the state board.

  It is a pilot program so the schools apply for this money on a competitive basis and the rules for the program were developed by the State Board of Education and they have a process they go through to determine the selection of the schools."
- Miller: "Well, the reason... there was some problems when these... when this had came up in regards to some schools that were interested in my area, you know, just because of the lateness of the announcement and essentially, just the way it was competitively issued. You had poor school districts competing with more affluent school districts because they were talking about suburban Cook or Cook County in general, versus maybe schools that could actually utilize these... this great technology even better. Is there any way in which we can ensure that the playing field will be more even... evenly disbursed?"

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Smith: "I'm sorry, Representative Miller, I don't... I don't understand. That was one of the keys when we adopted the initial legislation, was that the awardees in the program would be spread out geographically and you know, would take into consideration all economic levels of school districts as well."

Miller: "Are you planning on proposing... well... well, I would argue that, it really didn't when you... all things said and done in certain... certain communities. Just certain districts weren't just competitive. Is there any input that you may have with the Board of Ed... I mean, this is going to fly out of here... that will help try to balance those... that playing field?"

Smith: "I'd be happy to work with you on that and I'm sure we could talk to the State Board of Education on that and hopefully address your concerns. Because it's..."

Miller: "I just wouldn't want the same..."

Smith: "...it's certainly not the intent of the program."

Miller: "Well, you know, it's one thing to try to introduce technology, which I think is extremely important to those who are not exposed to it, but it's another thing if the same schools get the same grant in continuous. It's nothing to try to penalize, though, but a part of this whole education debate is to try to level schools up. And part of leveling schools up is exposing those to this type of technology and it would be a shame that the same opportunity is only given to those select few when within... when realistically some communities may just need a little help, may need a little push to try to be able to compete for this

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

tremendous opportunity. And it sounds like I've got your commitment to work on that to try to even the playing field and try to make this accessible to everyone."

Smith: "Abs... absolutely. Be happy to work with you on that."

Miller: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Smith to close."

Smith: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just ask for your favorable vote on this legislation, which would extend for three (3) years, what I think is a great program that has just gotten off the ground and we need to give it a little more life. I think it can do great things for student achievement and advancement."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should Senate Bill 746 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Feigenholtz. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 115 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 1 Member voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on page 10 of the Calendar, Representative Sommer has Senate Bill 768. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 768, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Tazewell, Representative Keith Sommer."
- Sommer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 768 authorizes the Department of Central Management Services to convey the former Illinois State

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Police Headquarters of Pontiac to Livingston County. This property has been designated as a national historic place and the conveyance would indicate the property would have to be used for a historical public use."

- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should Senate Bill 768, pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby being declared passed. On page 10 of the Calendar, Representative Colvin has... Senate Bill 776. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 776, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Marlow Colvin."
- Colvin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I ask for your consideration on Senate Bill 776. Senate Bill 776 creates a task force on the condition of African-American men in Illinois within the Department of Human Services. The directors and secretaries of various state agencies and boards will be members as well as the appointees by the Legislative Members. The sole purpose of the task force is to determine the casual and the actual factors for the condition of African-American men and to inventory the different state programs and initiatives that serve to improve the condition of African-American men.

63rd Legislative Day

- This task force once convened will be done at no cost to the taxpayers. There's no known opposition. I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should Senate Bill 776 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, 116 Members are voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the bottom of page 10, Representative Schock has Senate Bill 825. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 825, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Aaron Schock."
- Schock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 825 simply allows municipalities to collect the attorney and private collection agency costs associated with collecting fines on delinquent properties. I'm not aware of any opposition to this Bill. Be happy to answer any questions. And I'd urge a 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should Senate Bill 825 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 115 Members voting 'yes', 1

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Member voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on the top of page 11, Representative Mendoza has Senate Bill 841. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 841, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Susana Mendoza."

Mendoza: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate Bill 841 amends the School Code to require that the Illinois State Board of Education create an AP exam fee waiver program in public schools where at least percent of the students qualify for free or reduced price lunches. What this Bill would do is that it will allow all students to have equal access to a substantive and rigorous curriculum that it's designed to challenge their minds, enhance their knowledge and skills, and prepare these students for success in college and the work force. And I think that students shouldn't be hampered by their lack of ability to pay for an AP exam from taking those challenging and rigorous courses. This Bill is subject to appropriation and I know of no opposition. And would be appreciative of an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative John Fritchey."

Fritchey: "Thank you, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "She indicates she will."

Fritchey: "Representative, obviously this is a laudable idea from the standpoint that the financial inability is the last

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

thing that we want to see act as a barrier to reaching your academic achievement. So from that standpoint, it's fantastic. The one question I have, the threshold would be that the waiver program would be in those schools where at least 40 percent of the students qualify for the free lunch."

Mendoza: "Right."

Fritchey: "What if you are a student at that school but you are not in that income threshold to qualify. In other words, if you are a student that is fully capable of paying those fees but it just so happens that, you know, 40 percent of your fellow students are not, are you then entitled to the waiver, too, or is it just those students that qualify for the free lunch program?"

Mendoza: "Well, what we're trying to do is, any student who is not right now able to pay for that, in many cases they just don't take the class. And so under this Bill, some of the kids who I guess who would even qualify for 40 percent or reduced, don't register for issues related to stereotyping or stigmas and things of that nature. So what we want to do is just place a concentration on schools that are generally in depressed areas where at least that 40 percent of the population is eligible for the free or reduced and allow any student who, you know, just can't afford it but for whatever reasons isn't enrolled in that. And the program itself, have the ability to go ahead and take the exam. Could there be an instance where I think your question is referring to, could there be an instance where a child who could afford it

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

would now be eligible under this Bill? I guess the answer to that would probably be 'yes'."

Fritchey: "Well, let me come at that from a different direction.

Wouldn't it make more sense, from the standpoint of targeting the relief where it's needed and from the standpoint of minimizing these costs in an efficient manner, to say that those students who qualify for free or reduced-price lunches would then be entitled to a fee waiver? So, here's..."

"Right now, they are entitled to a fee waiver. If the Mendoza: students are currently enrolled in the 40 percent... in the free lunch program, they are eligible under current law. The problem is that based on the testimony of multiple teachers and, in particular, like in committee we had an interesting example of a person who used to be the principal of a school in a poor neighborhood, I think it was in Cicero, and now he's the principal of a school in Plainfield and could see the absolute difference, not just in the ability of kids to pay but in the philosophy of teaching, where those children wouldn't even be encouraged in many of those lower income communities to take the exam, even if they were able to, whereas it's just a school of thought in all of the richer neighborhoods that these kids take these In the event where a rich neighborhood school had one (1) or two (2) students who couldn't afford to take the exam, the schools would pay for those students. But when this principal was teaching at the poor school, it was just absolutely impossible for them to be able to afford to pay for those kids who weren't meeting the current

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

threshold which was the 40 percent or less, but they were nonetheless still wanting to take the exam but were just outside of that 40 percent threshold and to them they still can't afford to take it. So, we just want to provide an equal playing field for all of those kids. If they're able to intellectually meet the challenge of taking the exam and they can't afford to take it, we just want them to be able to have that opportunity. And again, this is subject to appropriation. There is no opposition that I know of and I would hope that we could support this."

Fritchey: "Well, that's fine and it's not my intention to stand in the way here. As I said, if the kids that qualify for the reduced lunches or the free lunches already qualify for the AP waiver, it just seems that we're potentially diverting resources by saying other kids that can afford this that happen to go to the same school, will now get the waiver as well. I get what you're trying to do. I won't belabor the point anymore. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Roger Eddy."

Eddy: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Lyons: "She indicates she will."

Eddy: "Representative, I want to make sure I understand the intent of this. The Representative that spoke earlier certainly brought up an important point. That your intent is for students who qualify for both the 40 percent free reduced threshold..."

Mendoza: "Of the federal waiver, yes."

Eddy: "Excuse me. First the school qualifies..."

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Mendoza: "Yes."

Eddy: "...by being a 40 percent free or reduced lunch."

Mendoza: "Yes."

Eddy: "Then is it your intent that students who have their AP exams paid for, are students who themselves qualify for free or reduced lunch?"

Mendoza: "Representative, under current law they have that waiver, of the federal waiver of the AP exam fee. That is current law."

Eddy: "Okay. So, if you're a student, as the Representative who spoke previously mentioned, that does not qualify for free and reduced lunch however attends the school that does qualify, you will still be eligible for a waiver of the fees even though you don't qualify for the status of free and reduced lunch?"

Mendoza: "That would be correct. If you attend one of those schools, that is in a what we would consider a poverty-type level area, then you would be eligible under this Bill to have your fee waived for the exam. And again, one of the issues that made me want to even consider this, was hearing the testimony from teachers who have both served at lower income poverty level area schools versus schools that don't even think twice about their students taking the AP exams because it's not an issue that ever comes up financially. And the teaching philosophy is actually different, many times unfortunately, in those lower income neighborhood Some of those children may not register for the schools. free or reduced lunch for reasons of trying to avoid a stigma or things of that nature but nevertheless they're

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

very intelligent kids who would benefit from being able to take a more rigorous or challenging course load."

Eddy: "So you belief..."

Mendoza: "And this is not a overwhelmingly large financial amount that we're talking about either, so in the scheme of things I think that the trade off of allowing these kids who are already in economically depressed areas where their teachers or their counselors aren't even encouraging them to take these exams, I think we're not really making a huge mistake by allowing them all the opposite..."

Eddy: "So your belief is..."

Mendoza: "A chance to avoid that stigma."

Eddy: "Your belief is that while there may be an instance where someone who's financially capable, very capable, in fact tremendously capable, who happens to attend a school district that is in a poverty area for the few of those that might actually..."

Mendoza: "Exist."

Eddy: "...slip under the radar and go ahead and get this AP, there are many, many more who probably didn't apply for free and reduced lunch, didn't have that status and overall that... it's... it's... there's more good that will come of this then those situations where someone who is very wealthy might get to take the test."

Mendoza: "Absolutely correct.

Eddy: "Okay."

Mendoza: "That's what we're trying to do here."

Eddy: "And it is subject to appropriations..."

Mendoza: "It is."

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Eddy: "...and the estimate, you said it was a small amount of..."

Mendoza: "Around three hundred thousands dollars (\$300,000) to three hundred and fifty thousand (\$350,000)."

Eddy: "That's the estimate of what..."

Mendoza: "Yes."

Eddy: "...it'll take care of to kind of cover the over... but that's your intention. And there could be a possibility where a millionaire's son could take this test."

Mendoza: "Yes."

Eddy: "Could get it free?"

Mendoza: "Yep."

Eddy: "Well..."

Mendoza: "Or there could be an instance where they decide to pay for it and not have to go get a waiver..."

Eddy: "Why, I understand that, but..."

Mendoza: "...but..."

Eddy: "...what we're saying here is..."

Mendoza: "Overall."

Eddy: "...the greater good is to go ahead and allow it and filter those out and to go ahead and see if the appropriation's made and if there's a great deal of problems with those, we can always come back. We can track it, we can come back and we can exclude it if that begins to be a problem in the future."

Mendoza: "Absolutely."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you."

Mendoza: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mendoza to close."

63rd Legislative Day

- Mendoza: "Thank you for your questions. And I would ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should Senate Bill 841 pass?'
  All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?
  Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On top of page 11, Representative Don Moffitt has Senate Bill 843.

  Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 843, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Knox, Representative Moffitt."
- Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 843 is a very interesting Bill for me. It's an example of not all wisdom originates in Springfield. This is a student initiative in my district. They were studying wind energy and we actually have a school district that wants to combine with other school districts, form a consortium and well as the community college and some units of local government to form a wind energy company. What this does is amends the School Code and the Community College Code allowing them to do this and the good thing about this is that it could actually help a school district lower its cost and could actually generate some additional revenue. I have another school district, Bureau Valley School District, that has one wind turbine but it's just for

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

their district and they've saved significantly by putting that in. So I think this is going the right direction. When in times of high energy costs this is allowing schools to have an option here to have lower energy costs and actually produce some revenue. Be happy to entertain any questions."

- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should Senate Bill 843 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 11 of the Calendar, Representative Dugan has Senate Bill 850. Read the Bill Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 850, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: The Chair recognizes the Lady from Kankakee, Representative Lisa Dugan."
- Dugan: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 850 was a Member initiative of mine and Senator Halvorson's that deals with giving non-Home Rule communities... counties the option to fund initiatives like the Life Education Center Programs that we have in Kankakee. It's skill... life-skill programs are very beneficial in counties and non-Home Rule counties are not able to help fund those programs even though they would like to. So this just changes the School Code to allow, not mandate that they fund them, but allow

63rd Legislative Day

- them to fund them if the county in that area feels that they would like to. So I'll answer any questions."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should Senate Bill 850 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is here by declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on page 11 of the Calendar, Representative Golar has Senate Bill 867. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 867, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Ester Golar."
- Golar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 867 (sic-Senate Bill) is a patient acuity staffing Bill. This Bill implements agreed language between the Illinois Hospital Association and the Illinois Nurses Association. This is a preferred strategy for ensuring adequate hospital nurse staffing rather then mandatory staff-to-patient ratios, so that hospitals have a greater flexibility in meeting the needs of patients based on the acuity of their condition and the capacity of the hospital to meet those needs. The Bill includes finding that evidence-based studies show that the basic principles of staffing in the acute care setting should be based on the complexity of patient's care needs aligned with available

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

nursing skills to promote quality patient care consistent with professional nursing standards and that compliance with the staffing requirements of this legislation promotes an organizational climate that valued registered nurses input in meeting the health care needs of hospital patients. I'll be happy to take any questions."

- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should Senate Bill 867 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Colvin, Verschoore. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 11 of the Calendar, Representative Beth Coulson has Senate Bill 937. Read the Bill Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 937, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Beth Coulson."
- Coulson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 937 is the result of a lot of work on the human papilloma virus vaccine issue, I'll shorten that to HPV as I speak. Basically, this Bill has been agreed to by the Department of Public Health, the Department of Health and Family Services and the Medical Society. We have worked on looking at making sure young girls are taught about the HPV vaccine and their parents are taught about the HPV vaccine. There is no personal mandate in the Bill, but there is a legislative mandate on insurance

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

companies to cover the cost of the HPV vaccine. And I can answer any question."

Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Jasper, Representative David Reis."

Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "She indicates she will."

Reis: "Representative, can you go over that real quick one more time? This thing has evolved and taken different shapes over the course of the year. So could you recap that again what this Bill does as amended."

Coulson: "Yeah. Essentially, what we tried to do is to take into consideration all of the concerns that groups had. We're providing education to young girls. As you know, the HPV vaccine could help us eliminate cervical cancer as a problem in the future. But we want to make sure the younger girls are aware of it with their parents and then they can make a decision based on risk factors, on whether or not they feel they should be... have the vaccine at a young age. But if they choose to have the vaccine, we'd like the insurance companies to pay for that vaccine because we do understand that it's a cost-effective measure and could actually eliminate cervical cancer in their later life."

Reis: "With regards to families who might be on Medicaid, will this require Medicaid to pay for them? That's question one.

And what about families that are not on Medicaid, will Medicaid still be required to pay for it?"

Coulson: "We actually... the Department of Public Health will, by the year July 1, 2011, provide HPV vaccines to eligible individuals at no cost. But it's funded through the

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Vaccines for Children Program, which is a federal program, so it's actually, in my mind, a very good way to help us to provide funding for the HPV vaccine for those who either are on Medicaid or may not have been able to afford the vaccine."

Reis: "All right. I don't see in the status of the Bill, is there a fiscal mandate on this and if so, what's the fiscal impact?"

Coulson: "There... as I said, it will be federally funded and I have not heard of any other cost, except perhaps for the educational brochure that the department would have to do, and I don't have a dollar amount but it shouldn't be that expensive."

Reis: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook,
Representative Monique Davis."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lyons: "She indicates she will."

Davis, M.: "Representative, will this vaccine eliminate all HPV viruses or just one (1) or two (2) or..."

Coulson: "There's one vaccine currently that addresses certain HPV viruses. There are other vaccines in the research stage right now and may come on board within the next year that will address other HPV viruses. I don't know if your question's getting at, will it eliminate cervical cancer? Not all HPV viruses cause cervical cancer. So, the vaccine is to go after those that cause cervical cancer."

Davis, M.: "But is it not true that there may still be other viruses that could still cause cancer?"

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Coulson: "There's still research being done on that, and that's one of the reasons we don't want to mandate this vaccine. We are still in the data collection stage of whether or not we can eliminate every single virus, but we... the data does show that it will help to eliminate cervical cancer if you receive the vaccine early enough."

Davis, M.: "So the little sixth grader gets how many shots?"

Coulson: "There's no mandate for a sixth grader to get any shots."

Davis, M.: "But I'm saying, but if the parent chooses to..."

Coulson: "If some... if a parent chooses to have their child vaccine it's... this... the only one that's on the market now is a three (3) shot regimen that they would receive over a period of time. That does not include any booster they may have to have later in life. But again, remember this... there's only one (1) on the market now."

Davis, M.: "So, it's just not one (1) vaccination, it's more than one (1) for that one (1) person?"

Coulson: "Yes, it's three (3) injections."

Davis, M.: "At least three (3)?"

Coulson: "Three (3) to start with."

Davis, M.: "And do we know what the side effects may be? How long has this vaccine been tested and do we have any idea what the side effects may be?"

Coulson: "You know, we... this... the particular one (1) that's on the market now has been approved by the FDA and this Bill does allow for any vaccine that is approved by the FDA to be allowed to be used for the HPV virus."

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Davis, M.: "I think you would agree, Representative, the FDA does not have a good record at this point. A lot of things that have been approved by the FDA are coming back to us telling us that this approved medicine also causes other things that they didn't know about and they're pulling them off the market. There have been even two (2) this very month."

Coulson: "And Rep..."

Davis, M.: "One (1) that was given for arthritis and I don't remember what the other was given for, so the FDA at this point really doesn't have a good track record."

Coulson: "And Representative, that may not have been a question but I agree with you in that right now though, we're trying... we're not mandating this vaccine for anybody. And that's one of the reasons I worked so hard to make it so that this is not a mandate on young women until we have more data. But we want women to know that they could eliminate a very deadly disease by having this vaccine and then they can make a choice."

Davis, M.: "Thank you. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "To the Bill."

Davis, M.: "I'll probably vote 'yes' for this legislation, but I'm really afraid that we might be going down a slippery slope. A pharmaceutical company has developed a vaccine that attacks perhaps one (1) HPV virus and the one (1) that you get may not be the one (1) that the vaccine was supposed to prohibit. It is really frightening when we start injecting sixth-grade children with something who's results we really are not sure of. We really are not sure what the

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

effects of this vaccine will be. We're not sure. What are the statistics out of how many women today who are sexually active, are people getting cervical cancer? You know there are many, many issues here that we're not addressing. I respect the Senate Sponsor, Debbie Halvorson, but I also know that there are a lot of unanswered questions. And I would advise any mother to be extremely careful with injecting a vaccine into his or her sixth-grade child rather than telling that..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative, your time is up. If you could conclude your remarks in the next minute or so..."

Davis, M.: "I was just going to say, rather then tell that child not to be sexually active, because you could get cervical cancer. I'm going to vote 'yes'."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Al Riley."

Riley: "Will the Speaker (sic-Sponsor) please yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "She indicates she will."

Riley: "Representative, you've done a lot of work on this Bill.

Is it not correct that though there are a lot of different strains of HPV, that essentially the one that this particular drug Gardasil deals with, accounts for about 75 percent of the cases that are actually occurring with regard to cervical cancer?"

Coulson: "Yes, that's the data we have right now."

Riley: "Okay. Also, one of the things about... about any drug in America, there's literally tens of thousands of drugs that apply for an IND, an investigational drug license virtually every year. Isn't that correct to your knowledge?"

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Coulson: "Yes. Yes."

Riley: "Most of those drugs that are introduced never see the light of day. Isn't that correct?"

Coulson: "Yes, that's correct."

Riley: "The clinical trials process is a long and rigorous one fraught with a lot of science and a lot of biostatistical analysis, right?"

Coulson: "Correct."

Riley: "There's phase 1, 2..."

Coulson: "And 3."

Riley: "...and 3 studies. Phase 1, being maximum tolerated dose,
Phase 2, being a study of the drug and its efficacy, and
Phase 3, basically being a randomized clinical trial and
that process takes, oh, between seven (7) and eight (8)
years, isn't that correct?"

Coulson: "Yes, Representative, and you know your... your clinical trials well."

Riley: "That's because I was a biostatistician in cancer clinical trials. Basically, in the debates that took place, there were people from the scientific and statistical community on the other side of the issue and a pretty rigorous debate took place during the introduction of this Bill, did it not?"

Coulson: "Yes, and we had scientists from both sides which is why we worked out, I think, a very good compromise and that is we're not mandating that all sixth-graders receive this vaccine, but we're saying that people should learn about it, understand what is going on, understand their risk factors

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

and whether or not they should think about getting the vaccine. And that's really what this Bill is all about."

Riley: "And at the end of the day, the drug was proved to be efficacious. All of the side effects were essentially listed, the amount of people who would have the side effect. I mean, all of that information came out in the light of day and essentially, the drug was released like other drugs that are released and the safety and efficacy of the drug was basically proven. Is that not correct?"

Coulson: "Up to this point."

Riley: "To the Bill. I think with everything else one must always take care on the kinds of things that we do to our However, one (1) of the things we also must children. care of is recognizing the always take role responsibilities of the scientific community. Everyone in this Body, no matter where you sit in this Body, takes some type of drug every day. And that drug went through the same kinds of scientific and statistical rigor that drugs have always come to... I mean, we've come a long ways since, you know, the enactment of the Pure Food and Drug Act, you know. So there's not a lot of snake oil out there that really There will always, there will always be problems exists. with any drug, but we really can't... we really can't be Luddites. I mean, we really have to understand that science and the development of these drugs is something, you know, that we need, you know, if we're going to continue to be a society, you know, where, you know, science is something that's going to aid us. And I think there's a lot of checks and balances that go on with a lot of these drugs. Believe

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

me, if there's any problems with this or any other drug, they'll be dealt with. And so, I think this is a good Bill and I urge its support."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Bill Black."

Black: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "She indicates she will."

Black: "Representative, what has been the... how long a study has been completed on this drug?"

Coulson: "Well, as the previous speaker mentioned, it's gone through all the phase 1, phase 2, and phase 3 trials. And that... and usually that takes many years. I can't speak to the exact number of years this one took."

Black: "Well, contrary to what the previous speaker said, many drugs go through very long periods of testing and yet every day on television I'm assailed with ads from lawyers about all of the drugs that I should call them immediately if I've ever taken, because there must be a hundred (100) class action suits going on in this country right now. Vioxx, Prozac, I mean, the list goes on and on and on and on and they say one of the side effects didn't show up, one of your loved ones may have died of a stroke, one of your loved ones may have died of a heart attack because they took drug A, B, C, D and E and F and G. You're in a health-related field. How long ago did you hear of this drug, because I have... I'd never heard of this drug until eight (8) months ago?"

Coulson: "Well, actually this is a vaccine and I have actually been looking into this issue for about four (4) years. I am not in this field so it may have been out there longer.

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Many women in government groups have been talking about how do we decrease cervical cancer in women, because it's a deadly disease. And there have actually been some studies about having people have a particular test to see if they had the HPV virus. Now that was before they have a vaccine. But if you knew you had it, you would then go and have pap smears more often. And that actually was the Bill that I had last year because we really didn't have a vaccine yet. So, this isn't a eight-month-old issue, it's a longer term issue but we finally now felt we could work out a piece of legislation that if we can eliminate cervical cancer this will help young women understand how to avoid it, young men also how to avoid getting cervical cancer, but also... not young men getting cervical cancer... but also we're going to try to make sure that each person who wants to get the vaccine can get the vaccine."

Black: "What drug company currently holds the patent? There's only one, isn't there?"

Coulson: "I believe this Gardasil is Merck."

Black: "Okay. Were there not news stories in Illinois where key Legislative Leaders had received substantial campaign contributions from this drug company and then this Bill was introduced short... not your Bill, the mandatory vaccination Bill was introduced shortly thereafter?"

Coulson: "I believe there were articles to that effect, but I will remind you this is... that is not this Bill."

Black: "But I said that, it's not... not your Bill. Now, I just...

I've had a bad feeling about this since those stories broke.

And one of the previous speakers did mention that while the

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

vaccine may have been around for quite a while it suddenly seemed to take off in various states and as the news articles, and I assume they were accurate, pointed out, they seemed to take off in states where the drug manufacturer suddenly became very active in the campaign structure, which they have a right to do. Everybody has a right to do. But enough of that. Your Bill does not mandate the vaccine, it simply is an insurance mandate, correct?"

Coulson: "There is an insurance mandate in here. We have not had opposition from the insurance companies to date because most of the insurance companies are providing this to their clients."

Black: "Well, that makes sense. If a two hundred dollar (\$200) vaccine, and I'm just using that as a figure, if a two hundred dollar (\$200) vaccine can save a two hundred thousand dollar (\$200,000) procedure later on, it only makes good sense. Prevention is certainly less expensive than trying to cure. So the staff says that opponents were pending when the analysis was done. Have any of those opponents come to you at all?"

Coulson: "No. As of the last few weeks, we've have no opponents..."

Black: "Okay."

Coulson: "...at all."

Black: "Thank you very much. You've answered the questions very forthrightly."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook,

Representative John Fritchey. And you seeking recognition,

Representative?"

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Fritchey: "Just real briefly, Speaker, if the Sponsor will yield. Well, she... To the..."

Speaker Lyons: Go ahead, John."

Fritchey: "Thank... thank you, Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentleman, I have a daughter who's going to be entering sixth grade next year. In a perfect world we don't need these types of vaccines, in a perfect world we don't need these types of issues. What we also don't need, though, are a lot of well-intentioned but I think misplaced arguments trying to derail this. The concept that had been thrown about earlier is a very different one than this is. This is a very reasonable attempt to give people the opportunity to protect their young daughters from a series of debilitating diseases. My wife and I have talked at length about this issue, we've talked to our daughter's doctor at length about this issue. We still have not made a final decision yet, but I will tell you I think that it is a tremendous opportunity to have this potential available to us. Again, you know, people could try to take this into bigger issues of abstinence or sexual counseling or whatever it may be, that's a different story, folks. What we are dealing with here is a medical advancement that can help the lives of young girls for decades to come. Is it proven beyond a Very few drugs are proven beyond a reasonable doubt? reasonable doubt. It's been proven beyond a scientific level of certainty and approval and it's met thresholds handily and then some. I'd submit that if we had other vaccines that were equally effective at treating their targeted diseases as this one is, we would be clamoring to

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

get those into the public as soon as we can. We do have a drug here that is available, that appears to work, that appears to have de minimis adverse effects and I think that we should be able to embrace not the red herrings, not the misarguments, not the misdirections, but the opportunities that we have for young girls that the women in this Body and our moms and our sisters, et cetera, didn't have available to them at the time. So I would strongly urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The Lady from Champaign, Representative Jakobsson."

Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Bill. This Bill would require that female students, sixth grade and older are given the information about the connection between the HPV virus and cervical cancer and what can be done to help prevent that. And for all of the people who have been talking against this, I wish they would understand, the bottom line is, this is about preventing cancer and saving lives. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Coulson to close."

Coulson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I would remind everyone that this is a prevention. We can actually help young women to not have cervical cancer later in life, but we can also educate young women and their families. So, I would encourage an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should Senate Bill 937 pass?'
All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?
Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr.

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

- Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on page 11 of the Calendar, is Senate Bill 1005. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1005, a Bill for a Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Reboletti."
- Reboletti: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This is a concurrence Bill. I'm sorry, it's not. This has come over through the Jud II Committee. The genesis of this Bill, what is known as Judee's Law, is a situation where an individual who lived in Will County was in Chicago. There was a motor vehicle accident, she was struck and the individual was going about seventy (70) miles an hour in a thirty (30) mile an hour zone and did not report the motor vehicle accident. So what this would do is move the penalties up from a Class III to a Class II if there's an accident involving personal injury and from a Class II to a Class I if it involves death and makes the Class I, extended term eligible. I'd entertain any questions."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Bill Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Lyons: "He indicates he will."
- Black: "Representative, we had a Bill very similar to this two (2) or three (3) years ago and they had a time limit to

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

report the accident, and down in my area you could sit at the scene of an accident for eons and nobody would drive by on some roads, but that... that's not this Bill. You hit somebody, you get out and you want to render aid and all of a sudden you see ten (10) people coming at you who you think are going to kill you. What do you do then?"

Reboletti: "The way the statute reads, Representative, is that you are to contact the local sheriff, local law enforcement jurisdiction, when you're able to do so. So that may be within fifteen (15) minutes, may be within an hour. It's whatever time would be reasonable."

Black: "Okay. So, I was misinterpreting this. You do not have to stop at the scene and immediately report... you should, but you've read the same articles that I have in the Chicago paper where somebody hits a child, they stop to render aid, they themselves are then killed by people who are mad that you hit the child. All right."

Reboletti: "I understand your concerns."

Black: "Okav."

Reboletti: "...and that would be... this should be covered by them going to law enforcement when it'll be..."

Black: "All right."

Reboletti: "...they'll would be safe to do so."

Black: "Okay. So they have a period of time in which to report the accident. Is that specified in the actual law?"

Reboletti: "It's does say within a reasonable amount of time."

Black: "Okay. Then I think that makes eminent sense. It isn't...

I misinterpreted it then. It isn't that they have to stop immediately at the scene and summon aid, it's just that they

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

must summon aid and report the accident as soon as reasonably possible?"

Reboletti: "That's correct."

Black: "Okay. Fine. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jim Durkin."

Dunkin: "Did you say Ken Dunkin or Jim Durkin?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sorry?"

Dunkin: "Dunkin or Durkin?"

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Now, I know Jim Durkin's a very attractive young man but he..."

Speaker Lyons: "It's the eyes, Representative, they tend to go."

Dunkin: "He doesn't look like me. Will the Sponsor yield, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lyons: "Indicates he will."

Dunkin: "I recall when I first got down here a few years ago, that we had a very similar Bill of an individual leaving... individuals leaving the scene of a accident. On the south side of Chicago just east of my district, there was an individual, or actually a group of two (2) in a van, it accidentally, I think the wheel... one of the axles fell off and it hit a curb and the people in the community attacked those individuals. And one of them was killed, another one was severely injured based off of the attack. That's a reality in some of our communities, quite frankly, and maybe some of the urban areas. How does this Bill speak to that type of dangerous, potentially dangerous situation. I guess

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

the… I recall the… from what I understand, the guys were drinking, they were sittin' around and they saw this accident and they murdered one (1) person and they severely beat one (1). How does this address that possible scenario?"

Reboletti: "Representative, I think it's what Representative Black was speaking about, which is if there's a situation that you couldn't contact law enforcement or render aid, nobody's going to ask you to put yourself in harm's way at that point in time to try to do that and risk your life for that, but only when it would be reasonable to so. I am aware of the situation that happened a few years ago in the City of Chicago."

Dunkin: "What prompted this legislation right now?"

Reboletti: "This was also a City of Chicago situation where the individual, I believe, was crossing the street and was... the speed limit there was thirty (30) miles an hour and this vehicle hit the victim at seventy (70) miles an hour and then continued on and then the victim died at the scene. I can also explain to a situation that happened to a Joliet police officer who was responding to a burglary alarm and at that time a person who was revoked for DUI, hit him and slammed him into a truck, he died basically instantly. And the individual took off and all that could be charged was a Class III and that individual received probation."

Dunkin: "All right. Are there current laws in place today that address an individual who may flee the scene of an accident?"

Reboletti: "Yes."

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Dunkin: "What are those charges?"

Reboletti: "Well, there could be or it could be..."

Dunkin: "Or statutes."

Reboletti: "...it could be a misdemeanor or it could be a felony, depending on if there's injury, how much property damage there is. So it could be a Class A misdemeanor for leaving the scene of an accident or it could be into a level of felonies if there's a certain level of injury or death."

Dunkin: "And so, does this legislation add to the offense level or the penalty level or does it pretty much make clarification? I'm trying to figure out where we're going with this given that there possibly may be additional laws on the books already or is this for a specific constituent that you're trying to appease, or satisfy, or we're trying to add more laws on the books. I'm trying really to figure out where we're going given that I know it's against the law already, certainly in the City of Chicago and I would imagine throughout the state that if you flee the scene of an accident that's not a bad... that's not a good thing. You're probably headed to jail unless there was some extraordinary circumstance that, you know, allow for you or justified your leaving that scene."

Reboletti: "Well, this is an enhancement of... you may or may not agree with an enhancement of the penalties. Are there actual Criminal Codes that deal with this, yes, but for the part involving the death, it would make the term of imprisonment from three (3) years... instead of three (3) to seven (7), it would go from three (3) to fourteen (14) years. So you're adding on because there was a death and

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

you failed to stop potentially to render aid when you could have saved that person and then the person dies and you've continued on after the accident."

- Dunkin: "Yeah. So let me ask this here, Representative. What is it that we are allowing judges to be judges for? Are we coming up with mandatory sentencing guidelines now or is it we're allowing them to be judges and make that judgment call? 'Cause I have to believe that some of the judges who are sitting on the bench today are highly competent, have studied the issues, the case laws, et cetera, and maybe they have a sense of if a person leaves the scene of a crime and it's just a blatant negligence where the person stayed there and died, that's already a criminal offense as you pointed out. And judges make the decision whether they should get... stand for a felony or a misdemeanor. I mean, is this just sort of good political legislation that we put extra on the books and we really take the..."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Dunkin, your 5 minutes has expired. We'll give a minute for Representative Reboletti to get back to you on. Wrap up your question in the next minute."
- Dunkin: "Again, if you can answer that question. Is this just good political legislation when we get back to our districts or we really want to take the judicial discretion from a judge?"
- Reboletti: "Well, first of all, Representative, the discretion is with the State's Attorneys Office and how they choose to charge the case has nothing to do with the judge. Once that charge is placed in front of the judge and there's either a

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

plea of guilty or finding of guilty at trial, then we get into the situation on what the sentencing guidelines should be and that's what we do. My understanding is with this legislation probation would still be eligible for each disposition. There's no mandatory prison time based on this. However, as we talked about earlier with Representative Dunn's Bill, we have situations where people continue to drive while on probation, while... especially involving cases of DUI or of this type of driving and it gives more flexibility for judges to sentence at a harsher level once these people have been given a chance under probation that now that they should spend a period of time in the Department of Corrections."

Dunkin: "But can't judges do that today?"

Reboletti: "Could they do that today?"

Dunkin: "Can they give you a harsher sent... penalty?"

Reboletti: "They could do that today."

Dunkin: "If a state's attorney proves his or her case?"

Reboletti: "That's correct. They could do that. but not at the level we're suggesting here."

Dunkin: "But a judge can make a decision that is... that's far exceeds really what someone even believes or thinks. I would think that a judge has the powers that you're looking to give them, they have it already. Am I right?"

Reboletti: "You're right but what this does if there is a violation that there'll be a little bit higher sentencing guidelines based on a violation if the person was placed on probation. I can understand what you're saying. If we took that discretion away from the judge because we said this is

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

a mandatory prison situation, now there is no discretion, these people could still receive probation. However, if they violate that probation, the time they could receive in the Department of Corrections would be longer."

Dunkin: "And they would get that today. If I'm on parole or probation and I break the law, leaving the scene of an accident, I know that I would... I could imagine that I'm up for some stiff penalty when I go in front of any judge. Am I right?"

Reboletti: "I can tell you that I've been in front of numerous judges and each disposition is different, depending on the philosophy of the judge. So there's no guarantee..."

Dunkin: "And depending on the case of the circumstance or that scenario."

Reboletti: "...even if you... even if you violate a probation does not mean you're going to go to prison."

Dunkin: "So Representative, would you be in favor of..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Dunkin."

Dunkin: "...us eliminating judges altogether?"

Reboletti: "No."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Dunkin, last question."

Dunkin: "Are we in favor... would you be in favor or us eliminating judges altogether out of our system here in this state because we are man... coming up with mandatory sentencing and judges... every single... a lot of legislation on this floor we come up with laws that take the discretion of an elected judge or appointed judge, away from them. And what I'm saying, like you're saying, there are circumstances

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

that are relatively unique that we can leave up to a prosecutor, a defense attorney, and a judge and a juror."

Reboletti: "Representative..."

Dunkin: "That's why I say this legislation, it seems or appears that maybe this is good political, you know, walk pieces or mail pieces."

Reboletti: "You may see it that way, Representative, but this is not for a walk piece. This is dealing with situations that happened every day in this state and that people do not take seriously. And no, I don't advocate for getting rid of judges. What we're trying to do is, we as a Legislature determine what their authority is in a particular case. They get discretion from the Legislature, it's just not some type of other right. But what we're saying is, we're... that we're... we want the message out to the community that if you violate these type of offenses this is the stiff penalties that you may face if you choose to behave like that."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Reboletti to close."

Reboletti: "I'd urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should Senate Bill 1005 pass?'
All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?
Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 107 Members voting 'yes', 6 Members voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'.
This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 11 of the Calendar, Representative Fritchey has Senate Bill 1026. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1026, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative John Fritchey."
- Fritchey: "Thank you, Speaker. After review of this we know of no objections to the Bill. I'd request an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: Any discussion? Representative... The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Golar. You seek recognition on the Bill?"
- Golar: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would like to be recorded as a 'no' on the last Senate Bill 1005."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Journal will so reflect. Is there any discussion on Senate Bill 1026? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jim Durkin."
- Durkin: "Representative Fritchey, just one… few brief questions.

  I... you spoke rather fast. Could you explain to me again what this Bill does?"
- Fritchey: "I believe I stated that the first time, you may have missed it, Representative. You may have missed it the first time and I'd hate to take up the Body's time again by going through a relatively lengthy explanation."
- Durkin: "I don't know if you noticed, but we're not going anywhere now or any time in the near future, so please indulge us."
- Fritchey: "Far be it from me not to indulge you, Representative Durkin. Essentially, what this does is expand the definition of 'frivolous lawsuits' to include second or subsequent petitions for relief. Under 2-1401 what we are looking to do is make it... we're trying to figure out a way

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

to get rid of the backlog of some of these frivolous lawsuits in the judicial system by making it tougher for some of these suits to be filed and giving us more ability to counteract those frivolous lawsuits. Yeah presently, if an inmate files a lawsuit which is found by the court to be frivolous they can actually have a revocation of a certain amount of good time credit. The determination is made by the judge hearing that specific lawsuit. This is simply an expansion of that."

Durkin: "So what we're doing is that we are... is that the penalty which we will impose upon the prisoner when it is determined that the filing is frivolous, it is going to be the department of... an order of the Department of Corrections to take away as you said, good time credit or is there also other sanctions which you are providing?"

Fritchey: "Okay. What... From a procedural standpoint and all kidding aside, from a procedural standpoint, we have a 2-1401 Motion, in this case they're not constitutional issues that are raised so they're not filed against the state and as such, those won't qualify as the frivolous pleadings that would potentially subject an inmate to revocation of good time. This simply expands this that this would cover multiple petitions for relief under 2-1401 as potent if they were found to be frivolous, that there would be some repercussions for the simple for the repeated filings of frivolous Motions which are simply tying up the courts' dockets and preventing meritorious suits from going forward."

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Durkin: "Do you think that these guys some of these people are lifers a lot of times who are going to have really... you think it really cares to them whether or not we pass anything to try... that says, that you know, behave yourself and don't pass anymore frivolous types of claims?"

Fritchey: "No, it's a valid point and you know, unfortunately, we can't get to that... you know, if your memory is along the lines of mine is, you know, you and I started back at the Attorney General's Office way back when and I remember having to go down and take depositions on lawsuits which would have to be ten (10) times better than they were just to get to the level of frivolous. To the extent that we can do something to send a message to a large part of that prison population, to not only not bring these suits... when they are bringing these frivolous lawsuits or frivolous petitions, they are truly making things more difficult, not just for the general population but for the incarcerated population as well that are trying to get their cases heard through the system. So, what..."

Durkin: "Well, I recall one case in particular where an inmate filed that he had a... was denied constitutional... certain types of liberties because he was not able to get chunky peanut butter within the Department of Corrections and he was just left with smooth and creamy peanut butter. No lie, I'm not making that up. I mean, this is the type of nonsense and that's why I appreciate what you're doing but at some point I... we need to put something in there that's going to... I mean, I don't know how we can stop it at this point, but some type of review system within the Department

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

of Corrections that will determine whether or not this is a legitimate claim that's coming out of the defendants. I'm not quite sure if we can constitutionally do it, but I know what you're trying do. I thank you for fully explaining the legislation to me, Mr. Fritchey. Thank you."

Fritchey: "Well and unfortunately, Representative, I know that you're not kidding around because I had to litigate a case once involving a claim of cruel and unusual punishment that an individual could not get blueberry pie for dessert within the prison system. There is a problem. Obviously, we need to protect the constitutional rights of these inmates, but at the same time I do not want to see nor do I believe any of our colleagues want to see our court system used in a mocking way that simply hampers justice and doesn't further it. I request an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative, we still have questions. Well, Representative Monique Davis."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman... Mr. Speaker.

Representative..."

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Davis, M.: "...exactly what is it you want to prevent people who are incarcerated from doing?"

Fritchey: "What I want to prevent is them filing repeated lawsuits or repeated Motions found to be frivolous by the courts. Now we are not saying, Representative, a lawsuit that simply loses is far from a frivolous lawsuit. A lawsuit... and I'll give you..."

Davis, M.: "Well, I'm not asking you to define that. I'm asking you to tell me what you want your Bill to do."

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Fritchey: "I want my Bill to act as a deterrent to inmates from repeatedly filing frivolous lawsuits."

Davis, M.: "Okay, currently..."

Fritchey: "Because every court… every court hour that is taken up with a frivolous lawsuit is a court hour that cannot be used for a legitimate claim."

Davis, M.: "But currently, a court case is heard and if a lawsuit is frivolous this person is subject to losing his or her good time. Now, I do believe that a number of cases that have been accepted by the Northwestern students who have proven to save the lives of people in prison were based upon a lawsuit that had been filed by some of those inmates to try and take away a right from a person who is trying to prove his innocence. He's trying to prove his innocence. This is not taking away people talking about some condition in prison. You're trying to take away their right to add information to their cases and when I look at our analysis, our analysis is against your Bill. And I think rightly so. Our analysis states that, under Section 2-1401, an initial Motion filed to a... at a point in the case between convictions and appeals do not involve any issues of constitutional deprivation. They're not filed against the state, they are merely post-trial Motions on evidence. A number of these positions or petitions are being filed by prisoners in southern Illinois. And under current statute, they are not frivolous lawsuits and the prisoner is free to file as many as they want without losing good credit."

Fritchey: "What... what that means, Representative, with all due respect, two (2) things. It says that the post-petition

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Motions are not treated the same way... here, a frivolous post-petition Motion is not treated the same way as a frivolous lawsuit. That's what that reads. What this does, it does not expand the definition of what is or is not frivolous. It says we are going to treat the filing of those post-petition... post-judgment Motions the same way that we would treat the filing of the lawsuit. The example that you gave from the students at Northwestern Legal Clinic is an excellent example but doesn't apply to this. They were not taking up cases that had been found to be frivolous, they were basing these things a new..."

Davis, M.: "What's frivolous to you may not be frivolous to a man that's in prison for thirty (30) years."

Fritchey: "No, no, Ma'am."

Davis, M.: "If he's sittin' in a prison for twenty-five (25) or thirty (30) years, what you might see as frivolous he sees as is whole life."

Fritchey: "No, no, Ma'am. With all due..."

Davis, M.: "Oh, you don't think so?"

Fritchey: "No, Ma'am, I do not. If you let me finish I'll tell you why. None of those cases, and I'm going to tell you what, one of the individuals that I had the opportunity to work with actually on the other side of a case, was a gentleman named Ronnie Bullock. Ronnie Bullock, was the first gentleman freed in Illinois under DNA evidence. That doesn't apply to this type of case. It applies to the type of case as I talked about when a inmate sued the state for saying that it was cruel and unusual punishment that he could not get blueberry pie for dessert. As the

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Representative talked... Durkin, discussed the inmate that said that it was a deprivation of his rights not to be able to get chunky peanut butter and only creamy peanut butter. Those are frivolous lawsuits."

Davis, M.: "Not if he's allergic to peanut butter."

Fritchey: "Well, Representative, with all due respect, the issues that you are injecting here are serious ones. Those issues have nothing to do with this legislation. This legislation simply says that post-judgment Motions are going to be judged the same way that lawsuits are judged. If they are not..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative, your time has expired. We'll give you one more minute to conclude your remarks."

"Yeah. Well, I think this case... this Bill is much more serious than people want to pretend that it is. In the State of Illinois, we have imprisoned a number of people who were innocent, who were released after they were able to get someone to listen to them. And if you think a person who is allergic to peanut butter or peanuts in peanut butter is not serious, that means you've been out too long, Sir. You been out of prison much too long and you don't understand the conditions that a person has to live with on a daily basis. And because an ant is crawling up your sleeve and it doesn't happen to you every day, maybe it wouldn't be as serious as a person who has it happen to them in a nine-by-four (9x4) cell or what have you, every single day. I think this piece of legislation is worse than frivolous. I think it's... I think it's mean-spirited and I think it's an attempt to hurt people who are already hurt. Of course they're in prison

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

and they need to be, but we should not be taking away their opportunity to address the court on issues that they perceive to be important. What's important to a man serving thirty (30) years may not be important to someone who has their freedom to walk the streets and go where they want to every day. Should he have a right to file a lawsuit or trial about his cases, you're damm right he should have a right to do it. Now, if you're telling us it costs too much, tell us how much it costs, Mr. Fritchey. I'm through. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ken Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Mr. Speaker, I yield my time to my colleague, Representative Monique Davis."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Davis."

Davis, M.: "And so, do you have any... do you have any figures that you can give us on what it's costing the state?"

Fritchey: "Representative Davis, at no time during the debate and no time in the legislation did I raise the cost issue.

The issue that I raised is that legitimate suits from inmates get put by the wayside, legitimate suits from private individuals get put by the wayside..."

Davis, M.: "Who decides..."

Fritchey: "Will you..."

Davis, M.: "...which are legitimate?"

Fritchey: "Representative, I heard you out and then some. Are you going to let me finish my answers or not?"

Davis, M.: "Yeah, but I only have 5 minutes."

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Fritchey: "Well, you took up the 5 with the question. That's not my issue. I mean, Representative, with all due respect, my issue now is the accusations you made toward me that I take personally. What this Bill does and what you are trying to convince the Body it does, are two (2) different This Bill simply says that post-Motion petitions are going to be treated the same way that we have treated, for years now, lawsuits filed in the court system. lawsuits make it more difficult. An individual... this ... we are not saying that somebody is being forced to eat peanut butter because... and they have a peanut allergy, they're saying I like chunky, not creamy and they're going to file a lawsuit about that. I saved a copy of the lawsuit from the gentleman that sued the state that he couldn't get blueberry pie because it was exemplary to me and everything that was wrong with the judicial system. I have worked tirelessly with you and other Members of this Body to keep the doors of the courthouse open to everybody that deserves it. But at the same time, if we have somebody that's going to do nothing more than file lawsuits that are deemed frivolous by the judge, not losing lawsuits, frivolous lawsuits by the judge..."

Davis, M.: "What happens when a person files a frivolous lawsuit today? What happens?"

Fritchey: "If that lawsuit is deemed frivolous then when the Department of Corrections holds a hearing before the Prisoner Review Board to decide if there was a intentionally frivolous lawsuit and if there should be any reduction in good time... in good conduct credit."

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Davis, M.: "Which would say to me a prisoner would be darn careful not to file a frivolous lawsuit. Currently, the law says, if a judge rules that he or she has filed a frivolous lawsuit a hearing is held and he can lose his or her good time. So now what do you want to happen?"

Fritchey: "What I want to say is if we are going to have that standard for losses that actually do involve constitutional deprivation, that when we have post-petition Motions that don't involve constitutional claims. That don't involve constitutional... these are much less serious issues. Let's treat them the same way and there are going to be at least..."

Davis, M.: "They're much less serious..."

Fritchey: "...they're going to be..."

Davis, M.: "...to you. To you, they're less serious."

Fritchey: "No, they are inherently less... a claim of innocence is serious. An inability to get blueberry pie is less serious in my mind."

Davis, M.: "Not if you don't have much time to live. Not... you know, it depends, it depends on where you are in life whether getting blueberry pie is serious or not."

Fritchey: "I don't even know how to respond to that one."

Davis, M.: "I ask you to take this Bill out of the record."

Fritchey: "No, Ma'am."

Davis, M.: "Take it out of the record..."

Fritchey: "No, Ma'am."

Davis, M.: "...so that we can work on it."

Fritchey: "No, no. Ma'am..."

Davis, M.: "So that we can make it make some sense and not be further punitive to people who are already being punished.

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

We want to take away the constitutional right of people to file a lawsuit. Now, this Bill will probably get all kind of votes in here, but it doesn't make it right. It doesn't make it right, Representative."

- Fritchey: "I hold the speaker, sincerely, on a personal level. I think the world of you, Monique, that there's something you've worked on, I've worked with you nine (9) times out of ten (10). On this one we can respectfully, I think, disagree. We are going to continue to disagree; the Bill is properly drafted as is. Is serves a directed laudable goal of the state without infringing on anybody's personal liberties. I think it is the right Bill drafted the right way at the right time. And I'd request an 'aye' vote."
- Davis, M.: "But aren't they people attempting to add evidence to their... to their charges? Motions of evidence. See, if we take it out of the record, you can confer with your staff a longer time."
- Fritchey: "I don't need to... I don't need to consult with staff on this. I know what the Bill does. I've been trying to explain it to you as clearly as I can, if I can't do that then it's obviously my shortcoming and I apologize. I believe the majority of Members of this Body can make up their mind. If the Bill goes down, the Bill goes down. I don't presume that it will because it shouldn't."
- Davis, M.: "Well, to the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I believe that he may be well-intentioned, but I think as we think of prisoners who already can be charged by a court and lose all of their good time if they file frivolous lawsuits. If frivolous lawsuits are filed by prisoners currently, a

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

hearing is held and they can lose their good time. Now it appears that the Representative here wants to take away from them an opportunity to file Motions and information related to their trial. I get letters all the time from prisoners and I'm sure many of you do too, asking for assistance for various reasons or another. And because you're incarcerated doesn't mean you now lose all of your constitutional..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative, your time has expired. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you, I think. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Indicates he will."

Black: "Representative, there's nothing in your Bill that would prevent, inhibit, or punish, if I understand it correctly, any inmate who files a post-trial Motion. Correct?"

Fritchey: "That is correct."

Black: "Having a prison in my district, I think what your Bill does actually helps the previous speaker more than she understands."

Fritchey: "Yes."

Black: "When you have one (1) inmate who will file ten (10) lawsuits a week that blocks access to the courts by those inmates who have a legitimate post-trial Motion or a legitimate complaint against the system."

Fritchey: "If... if only I could have said that as clearly as you just did, I may have been able to short-circuit some of this. Yes, you're absolutely correct, Representative Black."

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

"Representative, thank you. And Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. Black: Having a prison in my district, about five and a half miles from my house, I can tell you that what Representative Fritchey is doing is, in fact, trying to help the very people who need access to the courts for post-trial Motions, post-conviction Motions or legitimate questions of legal issues dealing with their case or their incarceration. they often have to wait months to get a hearing before the judge because... let me just tell you some of the lawsuits that we've had in my home county that take up the time of the judge, that take up the time of the entire legal system. We had an inmate who sued the Department of Corrections, the Danville warden, the director of the Department Corrections, because the toilet paper available to him in the Danville prison was too harsh and too irritating and he demanded a brand-name toilet tissue. When they tried to adjudicate his lawsuit at the facility level, they told him they were not able nor equipped to give each inmate a specific type of item that they liked. That they went out for bid, that the product met certain bid standards and that's what they had to do. The lawsuit proceeded, he lost. The same inmate later filed a lawsuit saying that the soap that he was given in the shower was not soap that he used when he was outside. And therefore, the warden and the Department of Corrections had to get soap that he used when he was a free individual or he would sue them. tried to adjudicate it internally and say, we can't do that. With all of the inmates we have we can't order forty thousand (40,000) different brands of soap. We go out for

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

bid, this is the soap we buy, it meets the standards. there is some soap you want to buy at the commissary, we'll do the best we can to stock that. These lawsuits went on for weeks. It was shampoo, it was the water in the shower wasn't the right temperature. It just went on and on and on. In the meantime, there were legitimate inmate Motions that could not get into the court system. Representative Fritchey doesn't decide what is frivolous or not, neither do A judge decides after hearing all of the evidence, if, in the judge's opinion, the lawsuit was frivolous. it's frivolous you may lose some good time. Many of the inmates who file these lawsuits are never going to get out in the first place, so they don't care. There is a difference between, and I think Representative Fritchey is on record and all of us understand, if there's a problem, misdirected evidence, he has shown his empathy for those people who were sentenced incorrectly. He took a leading role on changing the death penalty, a leading role on reforming the court system, but he is, I think, on this issue, on task and on target. You deny legitimate complaints when you back up the system with lawsuits that most of us, if we all could get together after the Session, 98 percent of the things that John or I or anybody else who under... who has a prison in their district and has seen some of these lawsuits, most of us would agree 98 percent of the time that they were frivolous. That's all this Bill does. It doesn't deny anybody their right. They can still file a thousand (1000) lawsuits a month if that's what they want to do."

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Black, if you could conclude your argument."
- Black: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. All he's trying to do is to make certain that the courts are not so clogged and backlogged with lawsuits that will later be adjudicated by a judge as frivolous, he's trying to clear the calendar, urge people not to do that and let those with legitimate legal grievances get into court as quickly and as judiciously as possible. I think it's a good Bill. I hope you can vote 'aye'."
- Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill was on Short Debate, we put it on Standard Debate. We've had three (3) people speak in favor of the Bill, two (2) speak against it. Representative Washington."
- "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. John, you know, I think Washington: there's some confusion on this Bill because you know this Bill came out of committee and we talked about it, and if everybody knows, this Bill didn't have any opposition. Matter of fact, the ACLU, the John Howard Association, none of them opposed this Bill. And I think, John, in intention and spirits joined on to our intent to not make worse what people are going through that are incarcerated not to limited them but to give more freeway to if a court determine... you tell me if I'm wrong, John... that if a court determined that it was frivolous and that an inmate just was for the sake of going through the rituals of doing it, then there had to be some thing to get his attention to say, look, you keep doing this then not only you going to pay the filing fees and everything associated with this for robbin'

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

the courts of valuable time for a filing that could be something of substance rather than something that's simple. Isn't that what we discuss..."

Fritchey: "That is, Representative, and I appreciate you eloquently stating what we were trying to do and as the previous speaker had said as well, these suits have the effect of depriving legitimate claims the speediness that they deserve through our court system, and that's why we are trying to deal with them. I mean, my goodness, the appellate defender and the appellate prosecutor are both in support of this legislation."

Washington: "Right."

Fritchey: "You know, that's not a lineup that you see too often. You know, perhaps and... you know, the folks have known me for a while, my emotions sometimes will get the better of me, especially when my good intentions are questioned. If you want to question my intentions on this perhaps you want to question the intentions of the lead Senate Sponsors on this, Senate President Emil Jones and Senate Reverend James Meeks. I hardly doubt that President Jones or Reverend Meeks will be lining up to close the courthouse doors to valid claims by inmates."

Washington: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. And what my colleague just said, I think my other colleague's intentions were pure, I know they're pure. But at the same time I think she had misunderstood what's happening with this particular Bill and in no way that I would sit down and watch John go through the agony of being accused of something here that doesn't fit. So I'm asking that we support the Bill. It

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

came out of committee with no opposition. As it mentioned, Senator Meeks e-mailed us also on the Bill. These are people who are trying to bring a balance. The appellate defenders, all of these people normally would stand against something like this if it was more harmful to deny American citizens who are incarcerated justice. So I think this is a good Bill. And I, too, ask for favorable support."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Durkin, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

"Well, sometime back my name was used in debate and I Durkin: feel the need to make some further comments on this since I pretty much opened up this hornet's nest for the Sponsor. But, to the Bill. This is really a statement about where our judicial system goes. This is... you know, if you look around the world, the United States, Illinois is looked at... people laughed at the system we have because we are an overly litigious society. The Gentleman has reasonable Bill forward to at least let the court who will sit in the position of being the gatekeeper of whether or not this is a legitimate claim or not to make a decision of whether or not this should move forward. And if it's a person who is one of these individuals who is a serial, frivolous claimant in our courts that there should be some type of sanction imposed upon them. Now, on the other issues, we've made great strides in this state to improve the quality of justice and we are continuing to do that year in and year out and a number of you know that I was involved in that in the late '90s, and I wouldn't support a Bill that's going to prohibit someone from claiming their

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

innocence who've been wrongly convicted. So this is a very specific set of circumstances and anybody's been involved in these situations they don't realize how pervasive of a problem it is within our courts. So I rise in support and I appreciate the full and fair debate that we've given to this issue."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Fritchey to close."

"Thank you, Speaker, Members of the Body. You know Fritchey: when it's at that time of year that emotions frustrations tend to rise a little higher than they should Let me take the personalities out of it. I took this Bill with the best of intentions. I believe that it accomplishes a legitimate need without impinging I think it's the right thing from a anybody's rights. judicial reform standpoint. It's the right thing of keeping courthouse access open and free. It's the right thing of eliminating irrelevant in, yes, frivolous lawsuits from the It is not a dramatic departure from where we are system. today whatsoever, in fact, if you really look at it, it is not... it's hardly expansive at all of what we're doing but it is the right step to take. I appreciate the debate, probably more debate than the Bill merited, but to the extent that it helps everybody understand the issue a little bit better. I think we're all better off for it. And I request an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: The question is, 'Should Senate Bill 1026 pass?'

All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Representative Golar. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 111 Members voting 'yes', 4 Members voting 'no', 1 Member voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on page 11 of the Calendar, Representative Lang has Senate Bill 1047. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1047, a Bill for Act concerning human rights. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lou Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1047 establishes a state commission on discrimination and hate crimes. As you know, we have one in the state today which was created by executive order, we also know that there was a lot of problems with that last spring and because of the problems and all the noise that was attendant to that, that commission has done very little if anything for over a year. This would abolish the executive order and create a new commission and if we're serious about dealing with discrimination and hate crimes in the state we ought to have a commission that works, that does its job, and that roots out the evil that hate crimes are. And so I would ask your support on this."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing... the Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Rosemary Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lyons: "He indicates he will."

63rd Legislative Day

- Mulligan: "I noticed that the commission was appropriated, it says in our analysis, a hundred and fifty-three thousand eight hundred dollars (\$153,800) in FY07, and I guess the appropriation was... for the commission was... is now being built into the general operating lines of the Department of Human Rights. So, two questions. Where's the money coming from and doesn't the... can't the Department do this without this additional commission?"
- Lang: "Well, the commission exists today, Representative, but as we know it isn't doing very much and if we're going to have the commission it ought to be one with some teeth and one that can start over and do the job it was supposed to be doing, so that's what we're trying to accomplish."
- Mulligan: "All right. So how will you ensure that it will do its job and won't be a political fiasco as the last one was?"
- Lang: "Well, I can't ensure that except this would be done by an Act of the General Assembly rather than the Governor's executive order and I'm hoping that we'll get a better bang for our buck. We will get Senate confirmation of everybody who's on this commission."
- Mulligan: "Why, because the Senate's going to appoint them? I mean, how are you going to be sure that this happens?"
- Lang: "I can't be sure of anything nor can you, but if the Senate is going to advise and consent to every single one of the twenty-one (21) nominations, I think we can be sure at least that these won't just be people appointed by the Governor for political reasons."

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Mulligan: "All right, and what do you think about the money? If a hundred and fifty-three thousand dollars (\$153,000) was appropriated before, it doesn't sound like a whole lot except when you start adding it all up. So I presume they would serve with no salary and very little appropriation or any... the money would probably be just to cover the staffing?"

Lang: "That is correct, Representative."

Mulligan: "And so would that money come out of a line item for the Department of Human Ser... Department of Human Rights?

That's where it went. I think they absorbed that money before."

Lang: "I believe that's correct. It says, 'assistance and necessary staff support shall be provided by state agencies involved in the issues to be addressed by the commission.' So probably the Department of Human Rights, but you can imagine that there might be other state agencies that might address this commission as well."

Mulligan: "All right. The only thing is, budgets like the Department of Human Rights are not large budgets, so even small sums make a difference on, say, an additional investigator or something that they have going. So, I just want to make sure that what you're doing seems to be appropriate particularly considering the past history, so I think it's a good idea and that the money that is spent on this is reasonable and doesn't hamper wherever the budget is, particularly a department that comes through a committee that I sit on. So, I'd like to make sure that the money is fair."

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Lang: "And I will do my best to help you with that."

Mulligan: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Any further discussion? Seeing none, Representative Lang to close."

Lang: "Please ask... please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should Senate Bill 1047 pass?'
All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?
Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there is 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Fortner has Senate Bill 1097. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1097, a Bill for an Act concerning economic development. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes Representative Mike Fortner."

Fortner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 1097 creates a study to be done by the Department of Economic... Commerce and Economic Opportunity to study ways that we could do economic zones for the advancement of science and technology as a way to try and bring in those types of high technology businesses to the State of Illinois. As Amendment... as amended, that study will also draw any input from Members of the General Assembly and the public and the private sector participants so that we can really shape, hopefully going forward, a good policy for how

63rd Legislative Day

- we can set up those zones. I would urge an 'aye' vote. And I'm open for any questions."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should Senate Bill 1097 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, 115 Members are voting 'yes', 0 is voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 11 of the Calendar, Representative D'Amico has Senate Bill 1099. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1099, a Bill for an Act concerning the military. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative John D'Amico."
- D'Amico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Under Senate Bill 1099, current rights vested in active military and veterans would be enforceable as civil rights violations under the Illinois Human Rights Act. I'll answer any questions."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should Senate Bill 1099 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, 116 Members are voting 'yes', 0 is voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on page 11,

63rd Legislative Day

- Representative Ron Stephens has Senate Bill 1159. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1159, a Bill for an Act concerning property. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Bond, Representative Ron Stephens."
- Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill authorizes the Secretary of the Department of Human Services to convey certain properties in St. Clair County to the Edith Gould family for the amount of ten dollars (\$10). This legislation settles a property dispute that's gone on for some years."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should Senate Bill 1159 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mike Bost. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 115 Members voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 11 of the Calendar, Representative Bob Molaro has Senate Bill 1162. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1162, a Bill for an Act concerning motor vehicles. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Molaro."
- Molaro: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is an initiative by the Attorney General and the new car dealers. And basically, all it says is that within twenty-one (21) days if you go in and you trade your car in and you give them the

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

money to pay off the lien, they have twenty-one (21) days to make sure that they pay it. The Attorney General as well as every reputable new car dealer does that and they agree… they agreed to this legislation because there was a few dealers who held on to that money for a hundred (100) days or so and it went against the credit on the individual who traded their car in. There is no known opposition. And as I said, agreed to by the Attorney General and the new car dealers."

- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should Senate Bill 1162 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page 11 of the Calendar, Representative Eddy has Senate Bill 1165. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1165, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Roger Eddy."
- Eddy: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1165 is a continuing effort to clean up School Code and repeal several Sections pertaining to various outdated items. And I would be happy to answer any specific questions, but would request your 'aye' vote regarding this cleanup."

63rd Legislative Day

- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should Senate Bill 1165 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, 116 Members are voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the bottom of page 11, Representative Miller has Senate Bill 1169. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1169, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative David Miller."
- "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Miller: House. Today I bring before you Senate Bill 1169, a Bill that reenacts and amends several provisions of the Illinois Sudan Act which passed overwhelmingly in the '94 General Assembly. To give you a brief history of the travesty that has occurred in Darfur. Darfur's about the size of Texas and is home to racially mixed Muslim tribes. The government neglect has left people throughout Sudan poor and voiceless and has caused conflict throughout the country. In February of 2003, frustrated by these conditions, two (2) rebel Darfurian groups launched an uprising against the government. The government responded with a scorchy... scorched earth campaign and enlisted the help of militia Arabic (sic-speaking) nomadic tribes in a region against innocent civilians of Darfur. Since February of 2003, the

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Sudanese government has used rape, displacement, organized starvation, a mass murder, to kill more than four hundred thousand (400,000) and displace two hundred and five million (205,000,000)Violence, Sudanese. disease, and kill thousands of displacements continue to innocent Darfuians every month. Long-term peace in Darfur requires that the government of Sudan, the militia forces, and rebel groups of Darfur find a way to resolve the political and economic disputes. The international community managed to broker a deal in May of 2006 but the violence in Darfur actually increased in the wake of this deal. Even today, President Bush announced new economic sanctions against Sudan and called for a UN resolution to compel the country to stop stalling international efforts to halt the bloodshed in Darfur because he believes the situation has worsened. Others who have highlighted this condition have included Chicago Bulls star, Luol Deng, have heightened our awareness and most recently the stars of the moosey... movie Ocean's Eleven recently raised nine million dollars (\$9,000,000) for Darfur. The State of Illinois was the first to... state to respond to the conditions in Darfur from prohibiting state investments in Sudan and companies doing business in the Sudan. On February 23, 2007, a permanent injunction barring enforcement was issued on this Act. Senate Bill 1169 addresses the concerns raised by Judge Kennelly. The major provisions of the Bill are: prohibits the retirement systems from investing state funds in government of the Sudan and companies doing business in Sudan. This applies to the five (5) state retirement systems. The local pension

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

funds were removed based on the lawsuits. Pension funds may only invest in publicly traded companies that certify they do not invest in forbidden entities and private market funds that a retirement system is prohibited from investing in any private market fund that fails to either certificate or affidavit that the fund does not do business The Bill remains in effect while the Sudan or their officials are subject to sanctions under Federal Statute or Executive Order or until the State Department confirms that a Republic of the Sudan is no longer subject to sanctions by the U.S. Government. The Bill also prohibits all pension funds from investing and depositing in Illinois finance entities that refuse to certify that they comply with the High Risk Home Act... High Risk Home Loan Act. This is a very important legislation that Senator Jackie Collins has issued and want to give her lots of thanks and respect for pushing this Senate Bill forward. I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill is on Short Debate. We'll put it on Standard Debate, so we can have five (5) additional speakers if needed. The first is Representative John Fritchey."

Fritchey: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. To the Bill. I had passed legislation on a related issue some time ago, couple of years ago, and last year we had actually passed legislation expanding the teaching of genocide in our schools. I don't believe this Bill is going to need assistance but I will tell you, let me try to preempt anybody that talks about the burdensomeness of restricting

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

our investments, et cetera. Ladies and Gentlemen, you may glance at news stories now and then, unfortunately, probably on a daily basis about what's going on in Sudan. I would urge you at some point to actually read these stories or watch some of them on television. Time and time again, this country and the world has said never again, whether it was a holocaust or a genocide, yet we have not gone through a decade without a significant genocide somewhere around the Be it Armenia, be it Bosnia, be it Sudan, be it where we've seen just... throughout the world. We need to take a stand on these types of issues. This is not symbolic, this is substantive. It's the right thing to do for the words 'never again' to have meaning. The world needs to wake up. As we debate this Bill, kids are being killed. we debate, this Bill women are being raped. As we debate this Bill, people are being displaced solely because of their heritage. What is happening in Sudan is not a movie, it's not a miniseries, it is real life. It's going on every hour of every day. It is unconscionable to believe that these types of things are occurring in 2007 but they're occurring in 2007, just as they did in the '70s in Cambodia, just as they did in the '90s in Bosnia, just as they did in the '40s in Germany and Poland. This is every bit as tragic. If anything else, it's even more tragic because of the media exposure and the interconnectedness that we have through the Web, through television, through the media. This is not something that we are finding about after the This is something that's going on in real time and the world collectively is sitting back for too long. This

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

is a significant piece. It's not going to solve the problem, but it's going to send a very strong message at the right way and hopefully, if other states and other countries will join us in these actions, we can put an end to what is going to go down as one of the worse tragedies in history. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Brady."

Brady: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Indicates he will."

Brady: "Representative, in committee I asked you this question and I heard a couple different things when you were presenting the Bill. But at that time, this particular piece of legislation exempted out pensions outside of the five (5) state pension systems of the State of Illinois. Is that still the status of the Bill?"

Miller: "Yes. Yes."

Brady: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Chapin Rose."

Rose: "Representative, a couple of quick questions. The President Bush today..."

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Rose: "Thank you. Sorry about that. The Pres... President Bush today instituted sanctions against Sudan. What is different about your Bill than what the President did today?"

Miller: "Could you repeat the last part about that?"

Rose: "What's different about your Bill than what President Bush did today?"

Miller: "Our legislation today covers the pension systems in the State of Illinois."

63rd Legislative Day

- Rose: "Well, I understand that, but the President today clamped down on businesses doing fin... businesses doing financial transactions with the Sudan and Sudanese government. So my question is, is your Bill the same as, narrower in scope, or broader in scope than what the President did today?"
- Miller: "You know, I'd say it augments it, but I believe President Bush's announcement dealt with most of the oil and how that relates to the Sudan, Representative."
- Rose: "And I noticed that part of your Bill here, it talks about banning financial transactions with companies that are out of the Sudan. But what about say a Coca-Cola that might sell one bottle of Coke in the Sudan, would the pension systems then be required to divest themselves of Coca-Cola stock?"
- Miller: "That's a good question. Coca-Cola has a permit and this legislation doesn't interfere with that. And back to your other question, Representative, you know, this specifically deals with Illinois funds and it just strengthens the language here in the State of Illinois versus the broad perspective that President Bush, which he is to be commended on his efforts on that today."
- Rose: "I agree. Well, there's no doubt this is an important issue. Is your statement about having a special permit, how does one obtain a special permit to then do business in the Sudan?"
- Miller: "They go through various federal departments, the SCC and U.S. Trade Department to get this."
- Rose: "Does that certify that what they're doing does not become part of this ongoing outrage in the Sudan?"

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Miller: "I would have believed so."

Rose: "I guess I'd like the answer to that question in a specific sense. How does one obtain this certification and let's talk about a hedge fund, for example. It would be... I guess, let's talk about Wilshire 5000 Index."

Miller: "Yeah. Representative, I'm not clear. Are you talking about the federal certification or the state which is entailed in here?"

Rose: "I'm talking about the certification in your Bill."

Miller: "Okay."

Rose: "And does that match the federal certification?"

Miller: "Yeah. You know, I'm not certain about that."

Rose: "Representative, and there's no doubt this is a serious problem that needs to be addressed and I think everyone in this chamber wants to address it. But there could be very large unintended consequences to the state pension systems if not done right. Could we take this out of the record even for just an hour to get answers to these questions?"

Miller: "No. I think... just so you know, the opposition... the questions or concerns that were raised by Judge Kennelly were detailed and outlined and worked through this particular legislation. There's no opposition to the Bill. We worked with those entities on those various funds and, you know, the Senate Sponsor is here and has been very diligently trying to work through it and those funds are not opposed to this legislation."

Rose: "And I appreciate that, Representative, I really do. I just would like to know exactly how you become certified in that process. I think it's a legitimate question because

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

- there's a difference between a company doing business that operates on the stock exchange, a mutual fund, a hedge fund, how do all these different entities become certified?"
- Miller: "Thank you, Representative. Let me just read something from you. For investment commitments prior... executed prior to this Bill, each fund shall 1) submit an affidavit in which an expressly authorized officer of the private market fund..."
- Speaker Lyons: "For the purpose of answering that question, Representative Miller, please continue."
- Miller: "Thank you. ...avers that the fund (A) does not own or control any property assets located in the Sudan, and (B) does not conduct business operations in the Sudan or submit a certificate in which an officer of the fund certifies that the private fund based on reasonable due diligence has determined that the fund has no direct or indirect investments in any companies, (A) organized under a Republic of Sudan (B) whose principal place of business is in the Sudan or (C) that conducts business operations in the Republic of Sudan."
- Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we've had four (4) speakers, two (2) in support, two (2) with questions in response. Our two (2) last people to speak... Representative Black, are you in response?"
- Black: "I don't know, Mr. Speaker. I read the federal judge's opinion and I don't know what we're doing here. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Indicates he will."

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Black: "Representative, you mentioned the federal judge's opinion, Judge Kennelly, took into account... his opinion specifically took into account the catastrophe genocide in Darfur that found that the previous law was unconstitutional because the Act violates federal constitutional provisions that preclude individual states from taking actions that interfere with the Federal Government's authority over foreign affairs and commerce with foreign countries. Now, I've read your Bill and I don't understand how this Bill addresses Judge Kennelly's basic one-sentence statement. I don't see any changes where we still aren't running afoul of Federal Law."

Miller: "Yeah, that's a great question, Representative. Judge Kennelly did not find the entire legislation unconstitutional, just portions of this legislation are unconstitutional. There was no severability clause within the language of the initial Bill. And so those concerns that were raised by Judge Kennelly were worked through... through the Senate and through the House and through negotiations to address those concerns."

Black: "Well, the judge specifically said, and I further quote,

'Even if the market participant exception applies to the
foreign commerce clause, Illinois is not acting exclusively
as a market participant through its enforcement of the
Illinois Sudan Act. Without the protection of the Market
Participant Exception, the Amendment to the Pension Code
clearly violates the foreign commerce clause.'"

Miller: "Yeah, that..."

63rd Legislative Day

- Black: "And in reading this Bill I don't see where that's been corrected."
- Miller: "Yeah, that specifically is concerned to the local funds which are now exempted from this legislation."
- Black: "I understand that, but the previous question in my opinion, the previous questioner did not get an answer to the question. How did Coca-Cola get an exemption and General Motors may not?"
- Miller: "And once again, that's on a federal level, Sir. That exemption..."
- Black: "Are we asking the Federal Government what funds we immediately have to divest and what funds we do not have to divest?"
- Miller: "No. We're stating in this legislation that we're only pertaining to the five (5) state pension funds in this. Your concern before dealt with... in initial legislation dealt with local funds, that has been exempt. This language which was based off of..."
- Black: "Well, Representative, all the money in these pension funds is not state money. There's a great deal of my money in there. There's a great deal of my wife's money in the Teachers Retirement System. She taught for a number of years. She relies on the maximum investment return by that board to ensure her pension. I don't think she's going to surrender to you or the State of Illinois any ability to maximize the investment potential of those pension funds. They don't all belong to the State of Illinois."
- Miller: "You know, that's... once again, that's a great question.

  There have been the creation of Sudan-free funds that have

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

out performed non-Sudan-free funds. So as far as their fiduciary responsibility, I understand that, but the argument is, is that these funds have outperformed other funds."

- Black: "Since many of the investments today are tied up in derivatives that may be made up of thousands of individual shares, how do you propose to divest yourself of that kind of an investment?"
- Miller: "Thank you, Representative. According to the pension funds, this would only affect a hundred and sixteen (116) corporations, out of fifteen thousand (15,000)."
- Black: "This is the same pension fund that has done such a marvelous job of managing our money the last few years I take it. So they didn't sign in op... any opposition. I find that funny because they often expressed opposition when we were doing this on the apartheid divestiture which I supported many years ago but the pension funds came down here and just had a heck of a time supporting that."

Miller: "Was that a question?"

- Black: "Well, is this the same pension fund that didn't support the divestiture of apartheid because they were losing their investment income. Now they come down here and say, oh, we're not going to lose any investment income."
- Miller: "Well, there has been the creation as I said earlier, the Sudan-free fund. I wasn't in the General Assembly when the you know, South Africa divestment legislation came through. I think it was an effective measure in which to deal with a, you know, a catastrophic situation just like..."

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Black, your 5 minutes are over.

If you could conclude your answer to the question for one

(1) more minute, we'd appreciate it."

"There's little more I can say. I don't think anybody Black: stands to condone what is going on in the Sudan and Darfur regions. Only a pure fool would say that that doesn't make a difference. I may be a number of things but I'm not a But my primary responsibility is to the fiduciary responsibility of pension funds that we have not always managed as efficiently as we should have. We certainly are remiss in our fiduciary responsibility by not making the required pension payments over the years, which has put our pension systems as the worst funded five (5) public pension systems in the United States. And when you do legislation like this, you inevitably... you inevitably will have the pension trustees dispose of assets at historic lows, so they lose millions of dollars. Whereas they will tell you, perhaps they didn't in this case, if they had been allowed to hold that investment they may have been able to recoup their market cost and to turn more than what we expect from them, an eight and a half percent profit every year. They may have, on some of these funds, made 10 or 12 percent, or more. They're not going to get an opportunity to do that. Foreign policy is best left to the Federal Government, that is a particular constitutional responsibility given to them. I voted for all of the divestiture Acts of apartheid years ago in the General Assembly. This one is a little more complicated and the pension system certainly isn't in the kind of shape now that it was fifteen (15) years ago.

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

would urge is caution that when you we as a Body, tell the pension funds what they are going to dispose of and what they are going to invest in, then don't... those of you who vote for this, don't criticize the pension system next year if they don't make the general not required... but the general eight and a half percent that we expect them to make. We can't have it both ways on this. We want them to maximize investment income because of the terrible shape our pension systems are in. And if anybody wants to yell time to me one more time, you tell that individual to come over here and yell time right to my face. All right."

Speaker Lyons: "Thank you Representative Black. I understand."

Black: "It's a standing invitation. Come over here and tell me that right to my face. Come on over here."

Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, please let's keep the decorum of the House..."

Black: "You are the most rude individual I have ever met on this House Floor."

Speaker Lyons: "Please."

Black: "You will not let anybody who disagrees with you say anything. You went after John Fritchey a half an hour ago and now you go after me for absolutely nothing, Representative, except I dare say on this House Floor something that you don't agree with."

Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Representative Black. Three (3) people speak in response to the Bill, two (2) in favor of the Bill. Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Speaker Lyons: "In response or in favor of the Bill, Representative?"

Lang: "I couldn't hear you, Sir."

Speaker Lyons: "In response or in support of the Bill?"

Lang: "I'm in support of the Bill, Sir."

Speaker Lyons: "Proceed, Representative."

Lang: "Thank you. To the Bill. You know, I understand all the questions that have been asked and they're all legitimate questions, but at its core this Bill is about what the state stands for. We should not be providing state taxpayer dollars from our pension systems to the regime in the Sudan. We should not be investing in companies that invest their money and therefore our money where these atrocities are happening, when these things are happening to people and when the government of that country seems not to be interested in doing anything about it or is inept to do anything about it. We have to stand for something here. And this is an important Bill to deal with that. We're going to have a Bill later, maybe today maybe tomorrow, that's my Bill that deals with a similar issue for Iran. And I'm going to be asking you the same thing because we should not allow our taxpayer dollars to be invested anywhere where they could be used to hurt people. It's just a simple equation. Please vote 'aye' on this important Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "I'm going to honor a request to have one (1) more speaker on each side. Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I fully intend to support this but there's two (2) things. First of all, there's a

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

provision in this Bill that has nothing to do with Sudan and I'd like to talk about that. And then the second thing is, there's a point I'd like to make about China. In the UN, China's blocking any resolution that would help what happens How many people here have traveled to China? China will not... will block this continually because they purchase all the oil from Sudan, the majority of their oil, and they also are human rights violators. So when we get mightier then thou about what's going on in Congress or what's going on with the United States Government, remember that we have also asked for sanctions from the UN and China has blocked them. And many of our Representatives here have visited China. So when you talk about where we should put our pension funds and that, I think you should take a look at what China's doing and how China is increasing the fact that the UN will not go into Sudan and help. Then there's another provision in this Bill and will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Indicates he will."

Mulligan: "In this Bill, which is a very controversial Bill, which most people will vote for, there is a provision that's the High Risk Home Loan Act. Would you explain to me how this got into this particular Bill and what it actually does?"

Miller: "As a request. Is it..."

Mulligan: "Would you explain it? I mean, it has nothing to do with Sudan. It has to do with an issue we've talked about in JCAR, it has to do with a Bill that the Governor has already vetoed and it's included in this provision."

63rd Legislative Day

- Miller: "Yeah, this... the Section that you're referring to has nothing to do with the... what the Governor vetoed... I believe you're talking about House Bill 4050... or overrode or whatever... what happened to it. But this is a part of the... as any Bill part of the negotiations in... The Senate Sponsor who is standing behind me and myself agreed to it and it's in the Bill."
- Mulligan: "Don't you think that the two (2) provisions are not totally related? Are you trying to say that they are related, because if you want to have a judge go after a Bill again, aren't you risking that factor when what you're doing is you're looking at something that has to do with home mortgage loans and then something that has to do with how we invest our pension money?"
- Miller: "Both topics deal with pension funds and how they are invested. So they are related."
- Mulligan: "Representative, I respect you as a Legislator, I always have. I served with you on JCAR."
- Miller: "I respect you too."
- Mulligan: "But the two (2) Bills putting together just seems a little disingenuous to me, to put the High Risk Mortgage Loan Act in with a Bill on Sudan which is so emotional so that you don't actually take a look at what's going on in the one Bill because the emotions wrapped up in what's going about Sudan are in it. So I think when you come to the end of Session and that's the way the Bills are, I think, put together it makes it a little suspect and that's the way you're going about it, but I do find... I agree with that part of the Bill, but I don't like the fact that the two (2)

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Bills are put together. I don't think it's appropriate. I will support your Bill because I'm certainly in support of the Sudan provisions although I don't see why we should divest ourselves. I could see new money going in pension, but I do think that this is a bad way to put two (2) Bills together just to get one (1) Bill passed. I think it's an insult to the Members of the General Assembly and it's an insult to the people that we represent to pass legislation like this."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Miller to close."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Today, let me just quote President Bush. The people of Sudan are crying out for help and they deserve it and we overwhelmingly supported this type of legislation before, not just dealing with Sudan as our Gentleman from Danville talked about the... from South Africa. It is time for us to make a statement in the State of Illinois. Yes, we want our pension funds to do well, but we do not want to invest in terrorist nations. Sudan, on a federal level, is listed as a terrorist nation. And so for us to divest from, it's only the right thing to do. For us to be able to contribute to those relief efforts, there are those organizations that are out there who are doing those good work of the people and trying to help the citizens of Sudan. There are many efforts from people across this country, as I mentioned earlier, who are doing the right thing. Who understand that people are... that genocide is going on as we speak today. I want to thank the Senate Sponsor, Jackie Collins, for all her tenacious work in making sure that this issue did not

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

die because of a judge's ruling. Her efforts have made this possible that we are leaders in the State of Illinois that we will not accept genocide no mater what form, where it is, and who's doing it. I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should Senate Bill 1169 pass?'
All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?
Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Representative Kosel, Representative Stephens. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 98 Members voting 'yes', 15 Members voting 'no', 1 voting present. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Representative Leitch. For what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Leitch: "May I have a personal inquiry?"

Speaker Lyons: "Please state your inquiry, Representative."

Leitch: "I had some important questions to ask about the substance and the impact of this Bill and I don't appreciate the fact I wasn't recognized. I'd like the Chair to tell us why that Bill was not put on Standard Debate, as often is the case, so that we could ask the important implications implied by the passage of that Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Leitch, it was on Standard Debate and I put it on Extended Debate to get one more speaker on each side of the issue."

Leitch: "Then why wasn't I called?"

Speaker Lyons: "We called on Representative Mulligan and then we had Representative Miller to close."

Leitch: "What?"

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Speaker Lyons: "On the request..."

Leitch: "So, since when don't Members have the right, under the rules of this House, to ask questions about important Bills that come before this chamber?"

Speaker Lyons: "Representative, we certainly try to accommodate as often as we can to extend debate so additional questions could be asked. We did not put it on unlimited Debate, we put it on Extended Debate."

Leitch: "Well, I think it is an outrage that that Bill was not put on unlimited debate because the implications of that Bill and the questions that pertained to some of the details within that Bill have a great impact on whether many of us could support that Bill or not. And I think it is just disgusting that that Bill was not given a more thorough vetting here in this chamber."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Black."

Black: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of my friend and colleague, Representative Leitch. You always have the power to extend debate to unlimited. That is a prerogative of the Chair. That's the House Rules. We don't need to ask you to do that, you can do that. When there are... and I have been in the Chair so I empathize with you, I know what's it's like to see half a dozen (6), dozen (12), eighteen (18) lights flashing, but that was an important issue. There had been an Amendment added in the House that hardly anyone was aware of. Representative Leitch had every right to speak. We used to debate Bills in this House for a considerable period of time. Some like that, some don't like that. But on a Bill that has such important ramifications there is no

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

reason why you couldn't, under the House Rules, have extended that debate to unlimited debate and given those whose lights were on the opportunity to represent their constituencies and the opportunity to ask questions of the Sponsor. And any time debate is limited, it diminishes the process and it diminishes the rights of each and every Member."

- Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Mr. Black. Ladies and Gentlemen, at the top of the page 12 of the Calendar, under Senate Bills-Third Reading, Representative Smith has Senate Bill 1174.

  Out of the record. Representative Molaro has Senate Bill 1179. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1179, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bob Molaro."
- Molaro: "Thank you. The Governmental Accounting Standards Board does now require that pension systems that have some of the money going to health care actually have to put it in a separate fund, any money that they put to health care. This allows the Water Reclamation District to put their money in a Health Care Fund. It's the same money. Just has instead of just one big fund they have to create this little trust fund to put the money in. Has nothing to do with anything except that. I'd ask for a favorable Roll Call. This is also called..."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is 'Should Senate Bill 1179 pass?' All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 115 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 12 of the Calendar, Representative Osmond has Senate Bill 1208. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1208, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Lake, Representative JoAnn Osmond."
- Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1208 amends the Illinois Insurance Code, provides that any policy of private passenger automobile insurance must provide the same limits of bodily injury, liability, property damage liability, uninsured and underinsured motorist bodily injury and medical payments to all persons insured under the policy as well as the person permitted to use the vehicle. I'll be happy to answer any question."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should Senate Bill 1208 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's a 115 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Peoria, Representative David Leitch."

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Leitch: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker. Since the rights of the Members are being denied here this afternoon, I think it's time we adjourn and I would so move to adjourn."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative, I want to make sure I do this right, so I'll be right back to you and nothing will move until we respond to your request. Mr. Leitch, thank you for your indulgence. We want to make sure that this is done correctly and according to rule. The question is, by simple Majority of those... by simple Majority, the question is, 'Should the House adjourn?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; all those opposed 'no'. The voting is open. It's nondebatable. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Cole. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill (sic-question), there are 49 Members voting 'yes', 66 Members voting 'no'. And the Hou... the Motion fails. The Chair recognizes Representative Black."

Black: "Mr. Speaker, I have an inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Lyons: "Please state your inquiry, Representative."

Black: "I would like a response, a direct response, because according to Rule 66, you didn't need to huddle for ten (10) minutes. Your rules clearly allow a Motion to adjourn, it is not debatable, it is immediately voteable, and I would like to know why it took you twelve (12) minutes to answer the Gentleman's Motion to adjourn. Does it take you that long to tell people how to vote? Or does it take you that long to get people to the floor to vote? Or does it take you that long to make damm sure that people are going to vote the way you want? That vote should have been able to be accomplished in thirty-five (35) seconds."

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Black, with all due respect, I requested the parliamentarian to make sure procedurally that we did the right thing on this issue and that's why David Ellis came down as the parliamentarian to make sure we're within the Rules of the House."

Black: "Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for you. I accept your explanation. I hope the next time a Motion to adjourn is made we don't have to delay twelve (12) minutes to get to a Motion that is in order according to the rules and is nondebatable."

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following legislative measure and/or Joint Action Motions were referred, action taken on May 29, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'approved for floor consideration' is Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 314; Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 620; Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1621; on the Order of Concurrence, 'approved for consideration' is a Motion to Concur in Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 982, a Motion to Concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1259, a Motion to Concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1384, a Motion to Concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1517, and a Motion to Concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1911. Representative Smith, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on May 29, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'recommends be

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

adopted' a Motion to Concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 3 to House Bill 1969; 'do pass as amended Short Debate' is Senate Bill 1183 and Senate Bill 1426; 'do pass Short Debate' is Senate Bill 543. Representative Jakobsson, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on May 29, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'recommends be adopted' is a Motion to Concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1256; 'do pass Short Debate' is Senate Bill 133, Senate Bill 942; and 'do pass Standard Debate' to Senate Bill 243."

- Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, on page 16 of the Calendar, under Senate Bills-Second debate (sic-Reading). We'll start on the bottom of the page with Senate Bill 171. Representative Fritchey. Leave that Bill on Second Reading. Representative Hernandez, you have Senate Bill 175. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 175, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed. Second Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. On page 16 of the Calendar, Representative Eddy has Senate Bill 184. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 184, a Bill for an Act concerning regulations. Second Reading of the Senate Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Eddy, the Amendment was filed today, so we'll have to wait. Leave that Bill on Second

63rd Legislative Day

- Order (sic-Reading), Mr. Clerk. Representative Mathias, you have Senate Bill 229. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 229, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. On top of page 17, Representative Leitch, you have Senate Bill 234. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 234, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. On page 17, Representative Golar has Senate Bill 307. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 307 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, move Senate Bill 307 on request of the Sponsor back to Second Reading. On page 17 of the Calendar, Representative Osterman has Senate Bill 333. Out of the record. Representative Gordon has Senate Bill 337. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 337, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendments 1 and 2 were adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Hoffman. Representative Eddy has Senate Bill 417. Out of the record.

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Representative Gordon, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Gordon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe the Clerk just read Senate Bill 337, we moved it to Third. However, the first Amendment was withdrawn. The only Amendment that was adopted was Amendment #2."

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, on Senate Bill 337, what Amendments have been adopted?"

Clerk Mahoney: "On Senate Bill 337, two (2) Amendments were adopted in committee, Amendment #1 and Amendment #2."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Gordon."

Gordon: "If we can just take it out of the record for a minute,

Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Leave that Bill on Second Reading on the request of the Sponsor. Representative Acevedo has Senate Bill 450.

Out of the record. Representative Eddy."

Eddy: "Inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Lyons: "Your inquiry, Representative."

Eddy: "Speaker, on Senate Bill 184 my intention was to have that Bill read a second time so that when it goes back to Second it's ready for the Amendment that's in Rules. Can you, for the record, clarify whether that Bill has now been read a second time?"

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, Representative Eddy's Bill, 417."

Eddy: "No, no. Excuse me, Senate Bill 184."

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, what's the status of Ho... Senate Bill 184?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 184 was a read a second time earlier today."

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Eddy: "So, it's..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Eddy."

Eddy: "It's back on Second and if we put an Amendment on it that comes out of Rules tomorrow, then it could be moved to Third and acted upon on the same day?"

Speaker Lyons: "Correct."

Eddy: "Okay."

Speaker Lyons: "We'll leave that Bill on the Order of Second Reading."

Eddy: "That's fine. I just want to make sure that it can be moved tomorrow to Third and acted upon in the same day.

Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Senate Bills-Second Reading. Representative Fritchey, you have, on page 18 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 593. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 593, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."

Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Rose, you have Senate Bill 607. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 607, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill.

Amendments 1 and 2 were adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Rose, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Rose."

Rose: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. Floor Amendment #3 represents an agreement with the committee. It essentially

63rd Legislative Day

- guts and replaces one (1) and two (2), Amendments 1 and 2, and removes the forfeiture language which was the cause of consternation in the committee. So to be clear, Floor Amendment 3 contains the underlying provisions of one (1) and two (2) except it removes the forfeiture language. I'd ask for its adoption."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any question on the ado… on the Amendment? No one (1) seeking recognition, all those in favor of the adoption should say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Krause, you have Senate Bill 689. Representative Carolyn Krause, Senate Bill 689. Out of the record. Representative Golar, you have Senate Bill 697. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 697, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill.

  Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments.

  No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Mendoza, you have Senate Bill 710. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 710, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill.

  Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments.

  No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Biggins, you have Senate Bill 735. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

63rd Legislative Day

- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 735, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. On the top of page 19, Representative Hannig, you have Senate Bill 767. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 767, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Osterman, you have Senate Bill 1007. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1007, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. All notes have been filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Marlow Colvin, you have Senate Bill 1164. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1164, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Jefferson, you have Senate Bill 1290. Out of the record. Representative Washington. Out of the record. Representative Acevedo, you have Senate Bill 1348. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1348, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill.

63rd Legislative Day

- Amendments 1 and 2 were adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. All notes have been filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Bassi, for what purpose do you seek recognition?
- Bassi: "Questions of the Chair, Mr. Speaker. Wondering why you skipped over 1201, Senate Bill 1201? Speaker, I just got the answer. So, I'm okay. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "We were told to hold that the last time.

  Representative, there was a temporary hold on that Bill, but
  there... if you wish to... Representative Durkin on the floor?

  This your Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill, 1201, Senate Bill
  1201."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1201, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill.

  Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments.

  No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Sacia, you have Senate Bill 1260. Is Representative Sacia on the floor? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1260, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Second Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Sacia on Senate Bill 1260."
- Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to table Committee

  Amendment #1 and move the Bill to Third."
- Speaker Lyons: "Motion to Table Amendment #1. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is tabled. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No further Motions."

63rd Legislative Day

- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Watson, you have Senate Bill 1360. Out of the record. Representative Mendoza, you have Senate Bill 1409. Out of the record. Representative Mathias, you have Senate Bill 1435. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1435, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative May, you have...

  Representative Karen May, you have Senate Bill 1579. Read
  the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1579, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No committee Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, back on page 19, Representative Jim Watson has Senate Bill 1360. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1360, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 was adopted. All notes have been filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Golar, you have Senate Bill 1664. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1664, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendments 1 and 2 were adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk."

63rd Legislative Day

- Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on May 29, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'direct floor consideration' for House Bill 1277 which referred to Third Reading."
- Speaker Lyons: "On Senate Bills-Second Reading, Representative Gordon, you have Senate Bill 337. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 337, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. The Bill was read a second time, previously today. Amendments 1 and 2 were adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Hoffman, you have on Second Reading, Senate Bill 363. Representative Hoffman. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 363, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Hoffman, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Yes. Floor Amendment #1 addresses issues that were brought up in committee regarding safety zones. Would only apply when workers are present and it increases the speed limit of ten (10) miles over to twenty (20) miles over in safety zones be reckless."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the adoption of the Amendment say 'aye'; those

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."

Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Reitz, on page 19 of the Calendar, you have Senate Bill 1094. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1094, a Bill for an Act concerning firearms. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Reitz, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Reitz on Floor Amendment #4."

Reitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #4 would add adjudicated as mental defective to the… to our FOID card legislation. This will correct an oversight. It mirrors the Federal Gun Control Act's regulations. The intent here is to try to take care of this oversight. It's similar to the oversight they had in Virginia in their law that led to the tragedy at Virginia Tech."

Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion on Amendment 4? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Bill Black."

Black: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Indicates he will."

Black: "Representative, let me scroll down, I apologize for the delay. Amendment #4, is it dealing with commitment?"

Reitz: "With commitment as... it just... it deals with anytime you've been adjudicated for any reason."

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Black: "Okay. The operative word there is 'committed' correctly? I mean, correct?"

Reitz: "That would be correct."

"All right. What if you have an individual who Black: voluntarily seeks out... and I use this from people that... in my district. When you undergo a plant closure and you're in your late fifties (50s), it can be very, very difficult to deal with. And that constituent who because of the plant closure, having worked there more than thirty-five (35) years, did seek out professional counseling. They found that... I don't know what the diagnosis was and it doesn't make any difference, but they did suggest that he commit himself to an inpatient treatment center. I believe he stayed there two (2) weeks, got everything worked out. And now we have some question on his FOID card because he's a very honest man and he marked that box, you know, yes, I have... I don't remember what it says, I've had treatment or something, and so he was denied. Now subsequently, the State Police have told me if will re... he... if he will reapply that they don't think he needs to be rejected for a FOID card. But I guess what I'm trying to get at and not saying it very clearly and I apologize, what if you commit yourself voluntarily to get some help over a tragedy in your life, a trauma like losing a job where you're two (2) years short from retirement, how... will that affect your ability to get a FOID card? You weren't committed by a judge but you committed yourself?"

Reitz: "I don't think this would... that would change at all."

Black: "Okay. So..."

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Reitz: "I think this just deals with someone that was deemed by the judge to be mentally defective."

Black: "Okay. So, in your opinion here the operative word here would be 'adjudicated'."

Reitz: "Correct."

Black: "A judge would have to commit you... well, then that brings up a question and I'm not a lawyer and I know you aren't and maybe when we debate it on Third maybe we could have staff or some... one of the attorneys in the chamber, a difference between a voluntary adjudication and an involuntary adjudication. Just something I think we might want to talk about on Third."

Reitz: "We'll try to check that out..."

Black: "Thank you."

Reitz: "...and at least take care of it in legislative intent."

Speaker Lyons: "Any further discussion? The question is, 'Should Floor Amendment #4 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. The Amendment is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."

Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, on page 20 of the Calendar, Representative Connie Howard has Senate Bill 1391.

Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1391, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Howard, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Howard."

63rd Legislative Day

- Howard: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #1 increases the number of days from 60 days to 180 days of good time credit that would be awarded to a prisoner who passes the high school level test of GED or General Education Development while the person is incarcerated. This credit is available only to those prisoners who have not previously earned a high school diploma. Would also provide that, subject to appropriations, the Department of Corrections would provide and pay for educational... please take that out of the record."
- Speaker Lyons: "On the request of the Sponsor, out of the record. Representative Flider, you have Senate Bill 1553.

  Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1553, a Bill or an Act concerning public employee benefits. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, on page 6 of the Calendar, under Senate Bills-Third Reading, Representative Gary Hannig has Senate Bill 152. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 152, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Montgomery, Representative Gary Hannig."
- Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

  The county board chairman from Macoupin County asked if we would work with him in an effort to have Macoupin County become part of the Metro East Park and Recreational District. Two (2) things that really have to have happen

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

for the county to become a full partner, one is we have to pass this piece of legislation and it has to become law, and second, the voters of Macoupin County by a front door referendum would have to vote to join this group. So, it would give the county some opportunity. It's something that they've asked us to do. I don't know of any opposition. I'd ask for you 'yes' vote."

- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should Senate Bill 152 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 61 voting 'yes', 54 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on page 15 of the Calendar, Representative Hannig has Senate Bill 1560. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1560, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Montgomery, Representative Gary Hannig."
- Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This proposal does a couple of things for noncertified personnel in our school districts. First of all, under current law, when the number of days that... when there's a layoff in a school district, the employees, the noncertified employees, are notified in writing and what this would extend to those individuals, is that when their hours are reduced that they'd also be notified in writing thirty (30)

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

days. Now there is a provision in here that says if there's circumstances that are... that have to do with the reduction in student population, so this could be special ed for example, then the written notice would only be five (5) days. The other important item that it does, it provides that in the area of recall, typically the recall is for a area of the noncertified personnel where they're in a certain category. What this law... what this proposal would say is that the school district would make the positions available to any of the noncertified personnel, assuming that there was no one to be recalled in that specific category; then it would be open to the others, assuming that they would be qualified. And of course, the qualifications are set by Federal Law, State Law, and by the school board, typically. So, that's the two (2) things that it would do. And I'd be happy to answer any questions and I'd ask for your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing... The Chair recognizes the Lady from Will, Representative Renée Kosel."

Kosel: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "He indicates he will."

Kosel: "Thank you. Are these positions union positions? Are these bargainable rights that we are interfering with with this legislation?"

Hannig: "Representative, it would... all we're changing in the Bill it says, on page (sic-line) 18 of page 2, it says, 'or any other category.' So, that's what we're inserting."

Kosel: "Are we interfering with bargainable rights with this legislation?"

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

- Hannig: "Representative, this is actually an initiative of the IEA and it's supported by the IFT. So, I don't think that they're asking us to interfere with their rights."
- Kosel: "Does this extend the rights that are bargainable to people that have not bargained for them?"
- Hannig: "I... could you repeat the question? I'm not certain I understand it."
- Kosel: "Does this extend rights that are usually bargained for
   to people that have not... that are not in the bargaining
   unit?"
- Hannig: "It simply says that for those noncertified personnel, that when there's a position that becomes available, if they are qualified then they would be considered for that position. That they would be given an opportunity for that position."

Kosel: "Thank you."

- Speaker Lyons: "No one seeking further discussion, the question is, 'Should Senate Bill 1560 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Pihos. Sandy. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, 111 Members voting 'yes', 4 Members voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, what's the status of Senate Bill 1397?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1397 is on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading."

63rd Legislative Day

- Speaker Lyons: "At the request of the Sponsor, move that Bill back to the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, what's the status of Senate Bill 677?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 677 is on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Lyons: "At the request of the Sponsor, move that Bill back to the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, what's the status of Senate Bill 1746?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1746 is on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, put that Bill back to the Order of Second Reading at the request of the Sponsor. Mr. Clerk, we'll be proceeding with Supplemental Calendar #1, Senate Bills-Second Reading. What's the status of Senate Bill 83?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 83, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. What's the status of Senate Bill 133?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 133, a Bill for an Act concerning public health. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. What's the status of Senate Bill 243?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 243, a Bill for an Act concerning regulations. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No

63rd Legislative Day

- Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. What's the status of Senate Bill 314? ...Bill out of the record. What's the status of Senate Bill 434?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 434, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Clerk, we'll leave that Bill on, at the request of the Sponsor, at Second Reading. What's the status of Senate Bill 543?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 543, a Bill for an Act regarding schools. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. What's the status of Senate Bill 620?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 620, a Bill for an Act concerning regulations. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 2 and 4 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #2, is offered by Representative Kosel."
- Speaker Lyons: "On Amendment #2, the Chair recognizes Representative Kosel."
- Kosel: "Thank you very much. I would ask for the adoption of this Amendment. It is the result of a exposé that was done in the City of Chicago on fire hydrants and the fact that many hydrants in the area were not working and many of them were controlled by a for profit water company. This

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

particular Amendment would address that need. It would make sure the fire departments know that those hydrants aren't working and will allow them to safely plan. It is good public policy and it is a safety issue. Thank you very much."

- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion on the Amendment? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should the Amendment be adopted?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, the second Amendment. Next Amendment."
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Dugan."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Kankakee, Representative Dugan. The Lady from Grundy. The Lady from Kankakee. Representative Dugan on the floor? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Mr. Clerk, hold that Bill on Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, what's the status of Senate Bill 778?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 778, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Bill Black. No longer seeking recognition. Mr. Clerk, what's the status of Senate Bill 831?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 831, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No

63rd Legislative Day

- Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, what's the status of Senate Bill 940?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 940, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Status of Senate Bill 942?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 942, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. What's the status of House...

  Senate Bill 1183?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1183, a Bill for an Act concerning energy conservation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill.

  Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments.

  No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Status of Senate Bill 1400?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1400, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Status of Senate Bill 1426?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1426, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendments 1 and 2 were adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Status of Senate Bill 1568?"

63rd Legislative Day

- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1568, a Bill for an Act concerning forest preserve districts. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Bill Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Inquiry of the Chair."
- Speaker Lyons: "Sir, make your inquiry."
- Black: "Yes. While the renovation of the chamber was done beautifully and by skilled craftsmen, everything in the chamber... do we have a warranty? Is it under warranty? It has come to my attention that the doorknob on the women's restroom fell off and that Mo, Mo was stationed back there with a pair of pump pliers, so the only way the women can get in the restroom is if Mo uses the pliers to open the door. So I assume that's under warranty and we'll soon get a new doorknob?"
- Speaker Lyons: "We're going to get right on that, Representative Black."
- Black: "Okay. Could I ask one more question?"
- Speaker Lyons: "Absolutely."
- Black: "Yeah. Do you know... did the Governor get down to throw out the first pitch at the minor league stadium in Marion tonight? Do you know whether he's on his way?"
- Speaker Lyons: "Haven't gotten a report on that, Representative Black. Maybe you could stay on that for all of us?"
- Black: "Well, I want to... the column, who is this, by Blackwell Thomas. The Governor wants to throw out the first pitch of

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

the Southern Illinois Miners at their new ballpark in Marion. A quote 'I'm keeping my fingers crossed and I hope to go,' Blagojevich said Monday as he arrived at the Capitol to meet with lawmakers about the state budget. 'If the schedule permits and we can work through these budget issues, then I can go down and participate in opening day.' Did we get through the budget issues?"

Speaker Lyons: "All right. He... he... I have..."

Black: "I seldom hear from him, that's the only reason I ask."

Speaker Lyons: "All right."

Black: "As far as you know, we didn't get through?"

Speaker Lyons: "It's still under negotiation, Representative."

Black: "All right. I'll..."

Speaker Lyons: "We sometimes seldom hear from him on this side of the aisle, also."

Black: "Okay. I'll... Maybe there'll be a column tomorrow and we can answer the question. And if you need me to stop by True Value or something, Menards, Lowe's, whatever, let me know, I'll pick up a door handle tonight."

Speaker Lyons: "Very kind of you, Representative Black."

Black: "Okay. Well..."

Speaker Lyons: "I think Mo will have that under control by tomorrow."

Black: "...anything to help out the women Legislators."

Speaker Lyons: "Thank you. Representative McCarthy, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

McCarthy: "Inquiry of the Chair, please."

Speaker Lyons: "State your inquiry, Representative."

63rd Legislative Day

- McCarthy: "Mr. Speaker, I just would like to encourage you, today we were expeditiously going through a lot of Senate Bills-Third Reading. We seemed to stop on 1166. In the past, you've been courteous enough to start with the next Bill the next day instead of going back to the front of the Calendar and many of us have been waiting for Bills late and high in number to finally be called. So I'd appreciate it if you'd give some consideration to starting with like 1174 tomorrow when we get into Senate Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Representative, and I will make the recommendation. Representative Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can I request something of the Members? And that would be that when we go to these committees, please everybody if you can, move as quickly as possible to the committee so that we can get the work done and move on with the other things we've got with other committees that are… we're facing."
- Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Representative Bost. We will recommend that. Ladies and Gentlemen, I still have some Bills to move from Second to Third Reading, so if you would bear with me for a moment. Mr. Clerk, we have Senate Bill 1621. What's the status of that Bill?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1621, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Lang."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Lang on Floor Amendment #1 to 1621."

63rd Legislative Day

- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment 1, except for the technical Amendment which is Amendment 2, becomes the Bill and this is a Bill that deals with the state investment and company... state pension investment and companies that do business in Iran. I could discuss it but I prefer to do that on Third Reading. I would ask that we adopt the Amendment."
- Speaker Lyons: "Any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should Amendment #1 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Amendment #1... Floor Amendment #1 is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Lang."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Lang on Floor Amendment #2."
- Lang: "Thank you. I move adoption of this technical Amendment."

  Speaker Lyons: "Any discussion? Seeing none, the question is,

  'Should Floor Amendment #2 be adopted?' All those in favor

  signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the

  opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Amendment #2 is

  adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read Senate Bill 314."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 314, a Bill for an Act concerning roads. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 has been approved for consideration."

63rd Legislative Day

- Speaker Lyons: "Hold that Bill on Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, what's the status of Senate Bill 940?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 940 is on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, move Senate Bill 940 back to Second Reading for a pending note. Mr. Clerk, what's the status of Senate Bill 243?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 243 is on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Lyons: "Are there any pending note requests on Senate Bill 243, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "There are several note requests that are still pending on the Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, place that Bill on the Order of Second Reading. The Chair recognizes Representative Harry Osterman."
- Osterman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Inquiry of the Chair."
- Speaker Lyons: "State your inquiry."
- Osterman: "On House (sic-Senate) Bill 940, what is the outstanding note?"
- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "A state mandates note on the Bill as amended has not been filed."
- Osterman: "I'd like to move that that note is inapplicable."
- Speaker Lyons: "There's a Motion from Representative Osterman that the note be held in status of nonapplicable. No, notapplicable. Thank you. All those in favor of the Motion should vote 'yes'; all those... the Chair recognizes Representative Reis."

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

Reis: "Inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Lyons: "State your inquiry."

Reis: "Is there more than one (1) note that's outstanding?"

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk. Additional notes?"

Clerk Bolin: "The only outstanding note is a state mandates note."

Reis: "What did the fiscal note come back as?"

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Osterman on the fiscal note."

Osterman: "The note was filed. The note was filed. I don't have a copy of the note. I know that it was filed."

- Reis: "I guess I'm arguing that we filed this note today and they got this back already. How can creating a whole new set of bureaucracy have no fiscal note to the Department of Human Services?"
- Osterman: "The fiscal note says no fiscal impact. And we're talking about the state mandate note, if I'm not mistaken. And Mr. Reis, if you want to, why don't you tell the Body why you filed both of those notes."
- Reis: "Because I think they're both going to be... they're both applicable and that they're going to cost the state money and with the budget, you guys are having trouble putting a budget together and I think that this is going to cost money."
- Osterman: "That's not what you told me. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to vote on the Motion."
- Reis: "All right. I would ask for a Roll Call vote and a verification of the vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, there'll be a vote on the note to be inapplicable to Senate Bill 940 and there's been

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

a request for verification. So, this will be a Roll Call vote. Staff is asked to please retreat to the back of the floor. Vote your own switch. Mr. Clerk, call the question. All those in favor of removing... Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The question is, 'In favor of the Sponsor of the Bill to hold this note inapplicable?' Those in favor of that Motion vote 'yes'; those against the Motion vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Eddy. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there were 54 voting 'yes', 60 voting 'no'. The Motion fails. Representative Osterman."

Osterman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the individual, Mr. Reis, who filed that note and did so at the urging of the NRA. I would encourage him simply to file the rest of the notes so that we can move on. File the rest of the notes so we can move on and debate the legislation."

Speaker Lyons: "Republicans, I do believe that Mr. Osterman had the floor. I'll be happy to recognize somebody in the response. So Representative Osterman, you're finished. Then it's Stephens."

Stephens: "Something's happened to my laptop."

Speaker Lyons: "Anything further, Representative?"

Stephens: "No, thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Okay. Thank you. Representative Mulligan, for what purpose do you rise, Representative?"

Mulligan: "Just a point of personal privilege. Representative Osterman had two (2) Bills up there. The first one was a controversial surgery center Bill that all of us flashed up on the screen and looked at it and some people turned away

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

and started talking about it. In the meantime, the Bill changed and this Bill came up. And then we went for the notes. So I think there was a lot of confusion on the floor as to which of the two (2) Bills we were voting on for people that were already talking on the first Bill, which I think is Senate Bill 243 as somebody's telling me, but we looked at it and then the Bill changed. So it went from a discussion on surgery centers to a discussion on FOID cards. And for people that looked away, it changed in about 2 minutes and everybody started screaming and then we took a vote. So, I think it's only fair for the Body to know and some of the Members that a lot of people voted on a different Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Bost."

Bost: "It's catching. I move to adjourn."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative John Bradley for an announcement."

Representative John Bradley."

Bradley, J.: "Thank you. I was having a brain cramp there.

Revenue will meet in 115."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Elaine Nekritz."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Elections Committee that was briefly scheduled and then unscheduled is in fact canceled for this afternoon. We're still on for Thursday morning."

Speaker Lyons: "Agreed Resolutions, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 472, offered by Representative Black. House Resolution 473, offered by Representative Dugan. House Resolutions 475 and 476,

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

offered by Representative Dugan. House Resolution 477, offered by Representative Riley, and House Resolution 479, offered by Representative Sacia. And Senate Joint Resolution... House Resolution 479, offered by Representative Sacia."

Speaker Lyons: "All those in favor of the Agreed Resolutions indicate by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Now, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, the House will convene tomorrow... Representative Currie moves that the House will convene tomorrow at 10:00 a.m. on Wednesday, May 29 (sic-May30), allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk. Representative Joyce."

Joyce: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Purpose of an announcement.

Aging tomorrow will meet closer to 8:45 than 8:30. Thanks."

Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Representative Joyce. And now, Representative Barbara Flynn Currie moves that the House stand adjourned until the hour of 10:00 a.m. tomorrow, Wednesday, May 29 (sic 30), allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk. Motion is should the House adjourn, all those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Thank you, my Republican friends, for a very interesting day in the Chair. Have a safe and enjoyable evening everyone. Thank you very much."

Clerk Bolin: "The House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Second Reading of House Bills that will be held on the Order of House Bills-Second Reading. House Bill 119, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

House Bill 124, a Bill for an Act concerning Bill. regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 191, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 475, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this House House Bill 750, a Bill for an Act concerning Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 969, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 1283, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 1427, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 1445, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 1631, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 1669... House Bill 1669, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 2135, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 2362, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 2616, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 2755, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 3079, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 3170, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 3424, a Bill for an Act concerning vehicle emissions. Second Reading of

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

this House Bill. House Bill 3453, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Second Reading of this House Bill. Second Reading of Senate Bills that'll be read for a second time and held on the Order of Second Reading. Senate Bill 171, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 175, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Second Reading... Second Reading of this Senate Bill which has been moved previously today to Third Reading. Senate Bill 215, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Bill 333, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 392, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Bill 435, Bill for Senate a an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 450, a Bill for an Act concerning law enforcement. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 478, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 513, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 572, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 753, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1290, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1318, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1358, a Bill for an Act concerning fire safety. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1409, a Bill for

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1460, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1674, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 17, offered by Representative Reitz, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 783, offered by Representative Dunkin, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Senate Bill 873, offered by Nekritz, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. First Reading of these Senate Bills. Introduction of Resolutions. Senate Joint Resolution 27, offered by Representative Nekritz. This Resolution's referred to the House Rules Committee."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Representative Brosnahan, Chairperson Committee Reports. from the Committee on Telecommunications, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on May 29, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'recommends be adopted' is Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 678. Representative Osterman, Chairperson from the Committee on Labor, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on May 29, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass Short Debate' is Senate Bill 1314; 'do pass as amended Short Debate' is Senate Bill 1529. Representative Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on May 29, 2007, reported the same back with the recommendations: 'do pass Short Debate' is Senate Bill 829

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

and Senate Bill 1132; 'do pass as amended Short Debate' is Senate Bill 1424, and House Bill 2584. Representative Rich Bradley, Chairperson from the Committee on Personnel & Pensions, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on May 29, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'recommends be adopted' and Motion to Concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1960; 'do pass as amended Short Debate' is Senate Bill 65 and Senate Bill 1380; 'do pass Short Debate' is Senate Bill 826. Representative Holbrook, Chairperson from the Committee on Environment & Energy, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on May 29, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'recommends be adopted' is House Joint Resolution 60. Representative John Bradley, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on May 29, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass Short Debate' is Senate Bill 764, Senate Bill 774, Senate Bill 797, Senate Bill 835, and Senate Bill 1041. Representative McCarthy, Chairperson from the Committee on Higher Education, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on May 29, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass Short Debate' is Senate Bill 1446. Representative Reitz, Chairperson from the Committee on Agriculture & Conservation, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on May 29, 2007, reported the same back with following recommendations: 'recommends be adopted' is House Joint Resolution 65. Representative Gordon, Chairperson

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

from the Committee on Judiciary-Criminal Law, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on May 29, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass Short Debate' is Senate Bill 1014 and Senate Bill 1509; 'recommends be adopted' is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill Introduction and reading of House Bills-First Reading. House Bill 4107, offered by Representative Sacia, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. House Bill 4108, offered by Representative Bill Mitchell, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 4109, offered by Representative Sacia, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. following House Bills will be read and held on the Order of Second Reading. House Bill 2584, offered by Representative Scully, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. Senate Bills. The following Senate Bills will be read a second time and held on the Order of Second Reading. Senate Bill 65, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Second Reading of this House Bill... Senate Bill. Senate Bill 764, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this Senate Senate Bill 774, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 797, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 826, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 829, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 835, a Bill for an Act concerning

63rd Legislative Day

5/29/2007

government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1014, a Bill or an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1041, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Second Reading of this Senate Senate Bill 1132, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1314, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1380, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1424, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1446, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1509, a Bill for an Act concerning sex offenders. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1529, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. The previous Senate Bills and House Bills will be held on the Order of Second Reading. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will adjourned."